

Also, petition of F. E. Bates, E. G. Wycoff, H. S. Wright, R. B. Williams, Harry G. Stutz, W. H. Storms, C. E. Cornell, R. G. H. Speed, R. L. Post, J. T. Newman, F. L. Morse, P. S. Livermore, W. O. Kerr, J. R. Robinson, S. L. Howell, Edwin Gillette, W. D. Funkhouser, B. S. Cushman, F. C. Cornell, H. A. Clarke, C. E. Treman, and L. D. Hayes, all of Ithaca, N. Y., strongly favoring selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Telegram from A. A. Hibbard, in regard to the movie picture "Patria"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter of the United States Land Farm Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., urging raising of army by the system of conscription and universal liability to service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter and two resolutions of Lyon Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Oakland, Cal., urging the acquisition of Lower California and universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from W. W. Donham, patriotic instructor, Lyon Post, No. 8, Grand Army of the Republic, urging military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegram from the American League of California, by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilber, chairman, urging the raising of troops upon the principle of universal liability to service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, pledging loyal support to the President and Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of military engineering committee of New York, favoring organization of new units of engineer troops by War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorials of Rotary Club of Brooklyn, Philadelphia Board of Trade, and Westchester County (N. Y.) Commission of General Safety, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of New Jersey State Board of Agriculture, in re food conservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Town Club, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Essex Trades Council, of Newark, N. J., in re food conservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Alumni Association of Stevens Institute of Technology, the Lawyers' Club of Washington, a committee of 100 citizens of Trenton, and the Lawyers' Association of New York, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of 40 citizens of McCarthy, Alaska, praying for the construction by the United States Government or authorization for the construction of a railroad line from some point in the Copper River Valley to Katalla oil fields and the Bering River coal fields, to the end that these sections be opened for development; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of citizens of Loveland, Colo., favoring absolute prohibition of liquor traffic as a war measure; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Tennis and Racquet Club, of Boston, Mass., pledging support to Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Boston Chamber of Commerce for universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorials of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States pledging loyalty to the President and favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring taxation instead of bond issue for war costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Billy Olin's gang, veterans of the Civil War, and board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Prof. R. Whitney, professor of economics, and 12 other professors of State University of Iowa, recommending a tax on special war profits, lowering income-tax exemption, increasing rates income tax, and high consumption taxes on luxuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Memorial of West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia, pledging the honor and lives of its membership in defense of the American flag and further pledg-

ing their support to the President and the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Memorial of First Baptist Church of Baltimore, to prohibit the waste of grain and other foodstuffs for the manufacture of alcoholic drinks, and, as a war measure, to prohibit during the war the whole liquor traffic of the country; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of the preparedness and survey commission and the county agents' advisory committee, joint committee in Maryland, urging selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Lawyers' Club of Washington, for selective draft and universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John U. Redwood and 33 others, for selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Department of Maryland, Grand Army of the Republic, and Confederate veterans, at a meeting in Baltimore, April 19, for conscription of physically qualified citizens for military or naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 24, 1917.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 23, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the following communication:

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., April 23, 1917.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
Vice President United States, Washington, D. C.:

The Texas Senate has to-day adopted simple resolution No. 12, introduced by Senators Robbins and Lattimore, the text of which follows:

"Whereas the National Congress is to-day considering the best plan of meeting the needs of this world crisis as it calls upon America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Texas Senate, heartily indorse the President's plan of selective universal military service and urge our Representatives to vote for the same and that a copy of this resolution be wired by the secretary of the Texas Senate to the President of the National Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington."

It is the request of the Texas Senate that this resolution be presented to the United States Senate.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN D. McCALL,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	McLean	Simmons
Beckham	Hollis	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Husting	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	James	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Coff	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Penrose	Trammell
Fernald	King	Pittman	Vardaman
Fletcher	Kirby	Polindexter	Walsh
France	Knox	Pomerene	Warren
Treflinghuysen	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson
Gallinger	Lodge	Saulsbury	Williams
Hale	McCumber	Sheppard	Wolcott
Hardwick	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] are detained on official business in connection with the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I wish also to state that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] is detained by illness in his family.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORF], who is detained on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. JAMES. I wish to state that the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] is detained from the Senate on account of serious illness.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is detained from the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask leave to offer an amendment to the pending bill that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator from Colorado has kindly yielded to me for a moment. I send to the desk a paper signed by the president and faculty of the University of Virginia. It consists of only about a dozen lines, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
Jefferson's Birthday, 1917.

To the honorable Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned administrative officers, professors, instructors, and assistants of the University of Virginia, being firmly of the opinion that the American soldiers to be enlisted for the war against Prussianism should be chosen, as President Wilson advises, "upon the principle of universal liability to service," and being convinced that the vast majority of the young men enrolled as students at this institution believe in this principle, do hereby respectfully but strongly urge the Congress of the United States to vote promptly for the same as embodied in the Army bill indorsed by the administration. We emphatically believe that the choice of soldiers by selective draft is not only the most practicable method but also the most democratic and the most just.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD without reading a memorial which comes from citizens of Holmes County, Miss., indorsing the administration program of preparation for war.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLMES COUNTY'S MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

The people of Holmes County, Miss., assembled in mass convention, fully realizing the gravity of our situation and the magnitude of the war into which we have been forced by the acts of war committed against our people and Nation, and being earnestly desirous of having our country do what is necessary to obtain a just and lasting peace at the earliest practicable time, and with the least sacrifice of blood—a peace that can only be obtained by a victory in war—we respectfully and earnestly make the following expression of our views and wishes to the United States Congress, and more especially, to our two Senators and our Representative:

Undivided military leadership and responsibility is essential to military success. Under our Constitution and the voice of our people President Woodrow Wilson is our Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. With his expert military advisers and the present war experience of the world he is better qualified to determine what men, organizations, equipment, and measures are required for our Army than any other man, in or out of Congress. The administration Army bill, now before the House and Senate, prepared by military experts, and having the hearty approval of the President and the unanimous indorsement of our military and naval officers, should be promptly passed as submitted. Divided leadership means deplorable weakness. The chief element of strength of the Teutonic allies, making them a menace to the liberty and peace of the world, is the absolute control of everything touching the military vested in the Kaiser. Our only hope of success and that of the liberty loving part of the world is complete mobilization of the military resources of our own country and of each of its associates, and thus defeat German efficiency by greater opposing efficiency, suspending for the time such of our rights as may conflict with military efficiency in order that liberty may hereafter prevail throughout the world, and forever.

Unreservedly do we commend President Wilson's definition of a country's call for its soldiery, embodied in the bill mentioned, "the principle of the selective draft, in short, has at its heart this idea: That there is a universal obligation to serve and that public authority should choose those upon whom the obligation of military service shall rest, and also in a sense choose who shall do the rest of the nation's work."

The call to colors, term it what you will, should be clear, direct, and imperative, and, upon all, within our national limits, coming within its requirements without reference to wealth, class, or color. By this means, and through military selection of each man intrusted with a responsible position in connection with the national army, politics, patronage, and pelf could be eliminated and military efficiency assured. Our Teutonic enemies are watching our every move and governing themselves accordingly. The moral effect of enlisting, training, organizing, and equipping an army of 2,000,000 men in accordance with expert military judgment would be immeasurable and might force peace before our Army fired a gun. A national volunteer army might involve, as did that of the Spanish-American War, much inefficiency and the filling of some military commands and of nearly all the positions intrusted with the distribution of food and medicine for man and horse with incompetent men, with the result, as it was then, that men and horses suffered for food and medicine, which the Government had amply provided, but its distribution was blocked by incompetency. Negroes constitute about 60 per cent of our population. To call upon the 40 per cent of white people to provide our State's quota based on

its whole population is absolutely unjust and wholly unreasonable. The negroes should be compelled, if necessary, to contribute their own quota. Under proper military training they would make as good soldiers. Certainly no such hardships and sacrifices as would be involved in exempting them should be thrown upon the white people of our State, nor of any other State, and would be indefensible. Let every race and class supply its own soldiery, and we shall gladly supply ours.

E. F. VOEL, Chairman.

Speech of Mr. Thomas, begun Monday, April 23.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in a flood of letters and telegrams with which I have been deluged from advocates of this bill I have found one dominant note. It is "Support the President," a sentiment which I most cordially indorse, and one which I have endeavored since March, 1913, steadfastly to observe. In an humble way I am partly responsible for his election and his reelection. It has been both a duty and a labor of love to support him, but I have not always been able to reconcile my own views of public duty with those of the administration. When that has been so, I have reluctantly but generally followed the dictates of my own judgment. That is the only way I can be of service to any administration. Therefore, until I am more enlightened that path I must continue to pursue.

I have never been a pacifist, although I have that horror of war which is inspired by humane sentiment and by actual contact and experience with its miseries and its brutalities. I have felt, ever since the President's ultimatum to Germany about a year ago, that war with that great military people was unavoidable. I thought at the time of its announcement that unless the war ended and ended soon with the defeat of the central empires, noncompliance with that ultimatum would sooner or later manifest itself. So when the breach came I was in a manner prepared for it. I supported the President then, as I shall support now every measure which, in my opinion, is essential to a vigorous and a successful prosecution of the war.

But, Mr. President, men past the meridian of life find it extremely difficult to change the convictions of many years; convictions based not upon impulse but upon careful study, coupled with an earnest desire to ascertain facts and determine essentials. Not even in a great crisis can such convictions be easily shattered or abandoned. Nay, I believe that then, of all times, one should stand by the institutions and the traditions of his country, yielding them only under the spur and stress of undoubted necessity, and keeping in mind at all times that the plea of necessity has been the basis and justification of every intrusion upon the rights and fundamental laws of the Nation.

Of course, I do not wish to be understood as assuming that the principle of compulsory military service, which is embodied in this measure, is beyond our constitutional power to provide. The safety of the public is the supreme law, and whatever is absolutely essential to the preservation of the Government in times of war is within our power and the power of the administration acting by our authority. When the time comes, Mr. President, as it has come to other democracies, and to ours in the past, for the adoption of conscription as the basis of our military system, I shall be as ready to acknowledge the necessity of adopting it, I trust, as any other Member of this body. I am not able to perceive that such a crisis has arrived. I may be mistaken in my conclusion; I may be entirely wrong; the conclusion may be obviously unsound; but it is "mine own," and as such I must be guided by it.

I have supported the President since his inauguration as governor of New Jersey. I supported him when men now calling upon me to do so by voting for conscription were denouncing him as they are now denouncing me. I supported him in his every effort to avoid this war, when obloquy and reproach were his portion, when defense associations and security societies and navy leagues and ex-Presidents were reviling him, and, Mr. President, I shall probably be supporting him when his new friends and champions shall have abandoned their zeal and resumed their weapons of opposition. And I am supporting him in my advocacy of the volunteer system, so closely and honorably associated with the history of the great race to which he and I belong.

Mr. President, opposition to compulsory military service is characteristic of every government fit to be called a democracy. In the long contest between the people and absolutism it was mutually recognized that military power was the basis of despotism, and that until it was curbed and minimized and controlled by the people free government was impossible. You may take the history of the English people, beginning with the day when the first glimmerings of popular liberty were observable in their deliberations, follow its development down through the centuries, and you will find their antagonism to a standing army whose basic foundation is compulsory service. I have not the time to enumerate instances. Suffice it to say

that the proposition must be conceded by everyone familiar with the history of the Anglo-Saxon race. It is observable in the struggles of peoples in other countries toward popular government, where their efforts were prevented by the strong arm of military power based upon and supported by compulsory service. Our ancestors finally established popular government by establishing the supremacy of the civil law over military authority. What wonder, then, Mr. President, that democracies abhor that principle of compulsory service the exercise of which menaces and may destroy their liberties? Their apprehensions may be unfounded, but they are inherent in lovers of liberty and therefore ineradicable.

It may be that such old-fashioned notions at this time, when a crisis is said to be at hand and the Constitution itself is said to be suspended, are out of place; that to invoke them will be nothing less than an effort to defeat or at least postpone the enactment of a measure of prime consequence, but I do not believe it. I observed when last week we were defending the liberty of the press we received commendation and applause from its exponents who now assure men like myself that the expression of an honest opinion in even seeming opposition to a measure like this has as its basis either folly or cowardice; but I am getting used to that. During the past two weeks these have been among the mildest epithets, punctuating some of the correspondence voluntarily thrust upon me for consideration. So, I am neither appalled nor deterred by the situation. I merely remind the press that the pending bill, to my mind, is of more importance to the people of the United States than is the press section of the espionage bill considered last week to the journalism of the country, and therefore entitled to the same deliberate and full consideration of the Senate.

In giving my reasons for opposing this bill I shall detain the Senate, Mr. President, no longer than I consider absolutely necessary; but inasmuch as I see, as I think the fathers of this country saw, in its enactment the ultimate supremacy of the military over the civil authorities we had best weigh both sides of the subject very carefully before reaching a final conclusion which may shape the future policy of this country permanently, and it may be disastrously.

I have said, Mr. President, that anticonscription is a democratic principle emphasized by its absence from democratic communities. There are exceptions to all rules. France has the system, as has Switzerland, but the reasons for it are obvious, since they both join the territory of the mightiest military power in the world, a power entirely devoted to militarism, whose boast is that it is a nation that is an army and an army that is a nation. Its known general policy, if not its actual designs, with regard to France and its immense superiority over the little Helvetian Republic have dictated a departure from the democratic principle and the adoption of compulsory military service for self-protection, but the exceptions prove the rule. England abandoned the principle centuries ago. Her people forced the Government to do so. It was finally relinquished, the throne trembling in the balance, with the specter of another Cromwell upon the horizon; and we, the children of the British Isles, bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, inheriting from our ancestors their antipathy to compulsory service, rejected it utterly, save as an alternative in times of national extremity. Even then its experimental value has proven negligible.

But we are now told that compulsory military service is democratic. Mr. President, that is a libel and a reproach upon the name of democracy. It is as repugnant to democracy as any despotic principle which can be conceived. Call it anything else but that and I may make no protest. You say it is based upon equality. But democracy does not mean equality and that alone. The terms are not interchangeable. If that were so, then I grant you, Mr. President, that a system which imposes the same burden upon the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the black and the white, the Jew and the Gentile, possesses one element of democracy. But the feudal system is democratic upon that reasoning, and slavery as well. Prior to the Civil War every black man was a slave, with here and there an exception, and that exception was subject to the bonds of servitude at any time. In bringing the African here no favorites were played; every black man caught and captured was exported and sold as a slave. Was that democracy?

We might establish, Mr. President, a state system of religion did not the Constitution forbid, and compel every man, woman, and child to observe its tenets under such penalties as disfranchisement, deprivation of goods or personal liberty. Would it be democratic because applying with equal force to all everywhere? To ask that question, Mr. President, is to answer it. Even the submarine war is democratic when measured by that test because its bloody program knows no exceptions. Whether

engaged in commerce or to relieve the sick and wounded, whether belligerent or neutral, all vessels are alike prey to the submarine monster, bent upon a sole purpose and achieving it in democratic fashion.

I might mention other illustrations, Mr. President, to convey the thought which I have when I protest against calling a system democratic, however necessary, because it claims to operate impartially. Democracy means liberty, and liberty is wholly at war with the autocratic weapon of compulsory service.

What peopled this country during the first century of the Nation's life with immigrants from the old country if their coming to our shores had not behind it the desire to escape from monarchies under whose laws they were compelled to live? It used to be said that every European peasant carried a soldier upon his back. It might be said that every European peasant was subjected to a system which compelled him to be a soldier. He came here to avoid that system. He came to a country where the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race prevailed and were universally observed; where free institutions underlaid the system of government; where military service was the voluntary sacrifice of the citizen; where their children have been taught that compulsory military service is a weed of pestilent growth wholly abhorrent to the genius of our institutions, to be utilized only when the Nation's life is imperiled, and that the Republic has waxed in strength and power by the steadfast devotion of its people to republican principles.

I have noticed recently, Mr. President, that in every modern propaganda of the peoples of the Old World, whether in Russia or Germany or elsewhere, one of the demands is the abolition of compulsory military service, a fruitful source, Mr. President—a very fruitful source—of what is popularly called international socialism. It must disappear if popular government once established is to endure.

It is equally true, Mr. President, that as the absence of this system is a characteristic of democracy, its presence is inseparable from despotism, and particularly from the modern despotisms of Europe, some of which are responsible for this awful war, the end of which I trust will sweep them forever from existence. With these we are now at war.

If the reasoning in favor of this bill be sound, Germany is the most democratic of nations. And Austria also. Between them is the home of the system. The mailed hand of these Empires closes upon all their subjects and forces them into the lines of their armies. They make no exemptions. Equality is not only the watchword but the unvarying practice. Then, too, the officers are competent and they are all powerful. The conscript is turned over to their rigid requirements of discipline and of training. He begins his service as a man; he finishes it as a machine, with neither mind nor purpose of his own. From such democratic systems may this country be delivered forever and ever.

It may be that we must fight the devil with fire. If so, I shall cheerfully acquiesce; but until it becomes necessary, and the system which I deny to have been a failure—the American system, the Anglo-Saxon system—is given its opportunity, I can not consent that we should adopt the compulsory service of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia, and make it the basis of a new military policy for the raising of an army. My refusal to do so is emphasized by the evident intention of the Secretary of War to make it a permanent feature of our Military Establishment.

Mr. President, what I have heretofore said assumes equality in the system; but I deny that it is there. There is nothing that may be called equality between men in America, except equality of right and equality of opportunity. Some Senators in this Chamber are dependent upon their public compensation for a livelihood; others so much more fortunate in their possession of the good things of life that their compensation is of little consequence. And so throughout the country there are men earning their livelihoods and learning their trades, men dependent upon their daily wage for existence and sometimes for the existence of their families, while there are others entirely at ease, either through the possession of inherited wealth, because they are the children of well-to-do parents, or because they have been more fortunate in their own struggles for existence.

Under this system you may take one man from an apprenticeship the completion of which is necessary to enable him to become an independent citizen, and you may take also the son of a millionaire and put them side by side in the Army. Is there any equality in this situation? The one must give the very prime of his youthful years to his country and lose the opportunity of acquiring a trade or pursuit which would make him not only a useful but an independent citizen. The other is

neither better nor worse off for being subjected to the operation of the system.

I might make many other illustrations. It is not necessary. There can be no such thing as equality of operation of such a system among men whose stations and conditions and resources are not comparatively uniform. So that the proposed change has not so much as equality to recommend it, and I am amazed that sincere and intelligent men do not perceive this self-evident truth.

As illustrating the so-called democratic character of this system I saw the other day a statement which applauded the occupancy at Plattsburg of the same dog tent by Mr. Vincent Astor and his valet, and the country's attention was directed to the fact that under such a system the millionaire at one end of the line and the domestic at the other were brought into democratic, and therefore into equal, contact with each other. Now, apart from the awkwardness of the situation perhaps to both, is not that merely an incident which may result from any service which, instead of spelling equality, only serves to accentuate the contrast in this world between men? And is not such a contact equally consistent with service by volunteers? Such evidences of democracy, Mr. President, mean nothing in a country like this. The contact in the training camp between the aristocrat and the plebian may be extremely interesting for both for the time being, but it is only transient; it disappears with the occasion. I have not heard that the incident was followed by an invitation from Mr. Astor to his valet to dine with him at any time or enjoy those other hospitalities which equality in life is supposed to inspire, nor do I expect to hear anything of the sort.

There are inequalities in race and there are race prejudices which might for the moment be obliterated by a necessary contact in the camps, whether filled with conscripts or volunteers; but who will pretend that those fundamental conditions can be at all affected by occasional contact in camp life or under the folds of the same tent?

I deny, Mr. President, that there is anything democratic about this system. So let us accept it at its face value, using it when necessary, not until necessary, and no longer than necessary. We must then ascertain whether that necessity confronts us. I deny that it does, albeit many persons have tumultuously wired me to the contrary. And, Mr. President, because of this experience I am tempted to say that if I had any loose money for investment I would buy shares in one or the other of the telegraph companies now doing such a prosperous and formidable business in transmitting voluntary advice to men in my position from all over the country. It is a good thing for them, independently of any other consideration. They require large sums of money, coming, I doubt not, from the pockets of patriots prompted by no motive but to serve their country. Those who have been good enough to communicate with me are divided into men who oppose and men who support this measure, and I venture to say that not one-half of 1 per cent on either side of the controversy have ever read this bill or know anything about it except as they condemn or commend its general principle, and acting upon that they cheerfully demand that Senators representing them shall vote according to their respective views. Needless to say, one can not do both.

It is rather embarrassing to a man who has no convictions of his own upon the subject to be confronted with such a situation. Such a man might avoid the dilemma by following the example of old Wouter Van Twiller—weigh telegrams and letters for against telegrams and letters against the bill. He might let avoirdupois determine the problem. Perhaps his conclusion would be quite as correct as if he attempted to adjudicate otherwise. Both sets of communications, Mr. President, contain evidences of propaganda, especially when, as in the instance this morning brought to our attention by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Stone], these telegrams and letters bear such a strong family resemblance, doubtless emanating from some central authority, either in idea or in expression, or in both. Those which I have received are subject to the same suspicion.

As illustrative of these propaganda I call attention to a full-page advertisement from the New York Times of Sunday, April 16, of the National Security League. I shall not read it, nor inflict it on the public through the columns of the Record. It tells us that "President Wilson's war message would be hollow words unless America acts." That is probably true. Then follows a reference to the Declaration of Independence, Patrick Henry's address, Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, and a few extracts from the President's message, ending by a call upon the people to urge their Senators and Representatives to vote for the administration Army bill. These things cost money. They must be paid for, as well as those on the other side, typified by a more modest advertisement I now exhibit, clipped from the

same paper, and equally earnest in its insistence that the policy outlined in this bill is all wrong. This comes from the American Union Against Militarism, 641 Munsey Building, and contains a coupon to be cut out and sent to headquarters, and I suppose there to be sent to the respective Members of this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. President, the safe and only course for a man to pursue when beset by such earnest protagonists and antagonists is to follow his own counsel, do what he thinks is right under the circumstances as best he can, and take the consequences. It is easy to follow the drift for the moment of public sentiment—the easiest thing in the world. That is following the lines of least resistance. If one can ascertain the drift of public sentiment and catch it and conform to it, he may escape much sorrow and tribulation in this world, albeit he may achieve the reputation of being as unstable as water. And he may prosper.

Mr. President, I am satisfied, not from communications and telegrams, but from an acquaintance with my people extending over almost half a century, that I know something about the way they feel upon this subject. I affirm that they are opposed to conscription except as a last resort, notwithstanding the fact that in our large centers, as in others, there is at present a sentiment, prompted partly by patriotism, partly by apprehension, partly by propaganda, which finds more active and violent expression than that deeper current of sentiment, running silently and quietly, but constantly, from the hearts and the minds of the plain people of the country who maintain its integrity and wage its battles.

Mr. President, we are about to violate a fundamental tradition of our democracy. We are about to do so in what many earnestly and honestly believe to be a very serious crisis, and because they also believe that without it the safety and possibly the existence of their country will be imperiled. I am not finding fault with these opinions. I have not, and trust I never will, say upon this floor anything that can be construed into a reflection upon the motives of my associates, except in so far as honest criticism may carry such an implication. I have never consciously inserted in the Record anything that even seemed to cast a reproach upon the good faith, the standing, or the convictions of my associates. Something was inserted this morning, a letter from a gentleman whose convictions are too strong and all pervading to permit the existence of charity for those of others. It has no right to a place in the Record; but it is there, and I do not complain. I shall not dignify this man by mentioning his name. His dogmatism is as narrow as it is offensive. He reminds me of that character in Lowell's *Bigelow Papers*, described as one who—

Couldn't see but just one side;
If his, 'twas God's, and that was plenty.

We have many such people in the world, Mr. President, and many of them favor this bill.

Some one has said that "vituperation is not argument, but a form of self-indulgence"; and a truer statement never fell from human lips. We can not reach the reason of others either by belittling their opinions or reproaching them for their expression. We make intellectual progress in this world only through impersonal argument and discussion, granting to every man the same sincerity and earnestness of conviction which we demand for ourselves.

In that spirit, Mr. President, I shall discuss what seem to me to be underlying and conclusive objections to the immediate adoption of the principle involved in this very important bill. The people of the United States may be entirely mistaken in their antipathy to compulsory service. In times past, when judgments were calm and deliberate, when excitement had not usurped the province of reason, those who advocated or believed in the system were few and far between. It was in distinct conflict with personal liberty. Opposition to it rose to the dignity of a race conviction. It may have been a prejudice, but it is too deeply ingrained in every Anglo-Saxon community in this world, wherever found, to be violated, except in the presence of a great extremity, which does not now confront us.

Of course, our military officers are for the most part the advocates of enforced service. But there are exceptions here and there even among these. I shall refer to two or three of the most eminent ones before I am through. But men of the military profession, thorough believers in that efficiency which comes from long service and thorough training, are restive under a system which leaves to the citizen the choice between the camp and the farm.

With the War Department, Mr. President, this proposed departure is no new thing. Those having our military affairs in charge are naturally, inherently, and constitutionally in favor of compulsory service. It permeates the atmosphere in which

they live. It is gathered and garnered from the line of their daily duties and experiences. They are not to be censured for it. They constitute a hierarchy, which very naturally regards the military as essentially superior to the civil branch of the Government. The existence of this sentiment is inseparable from the military life. Therefore we have always been on guard against it, as we should be now.

The same spirit exists in the Navy, and for the same reasons, therefore, you can not find a naval officer who believes that the submarine is displacing the battleship. Why? Because in the Navy, as in the Army, there is a hierarchy. There could be no hierarchy with the submarine. It has no quarter-deck. Within its small confines man and officer are brought into close and constant contact. Consequently the consensus of naval opinion among this hierarchy is that because the battleship has not yet been actually superseded we should continue to construct them more numerous than ever. So in our haste to get ready for the enemy we are feverishly building battleships and paying premiums for their speedy construction over the contract cost when not one of them can be finished before 1921. The space occupied by them in the navy yards of the country, and the men engaged in their construction, should both be utilized, now of all times, in the speedy construction of smaller craft—submarines, mosquito fleets, and so forth—vessels which can be completed in a short time and made immediately useful in this great struggle. For the present we have battleships enough, when we stop to reflect that our allies, long before our entrance into the war, commanded—subject to the submarine—absolute control of the seas.

Mr. President, this system in its last analysis—and we always come to that—means the seizure of the youth of the country and their subjection for the time being to a despotic system. The mind of the youth and of his parents instinctively recoils from such a situation. And this bill wholly fails to distribute the burden. It does not pretend to be universal. It takes one and passes five. It proceeds upon the old scriptural assurance that many are called but few are chosen.

Something has been said here about the conscript system in the South during the Civil War, to which resort was had in 1862. It may be, Mr. President, that my contact with the attempted enforcement of that system during my boyhood has something to do with my repugnance to it. Yet I say that down there—and I challenge successful contradiction—in my part of the country it was a failure.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It was everywhere.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator recall how the draft was enforced in the State of New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. FALL. Volunteer regiments enforced the draft in New York, who were called upon, and had to be called upon, to put down the riots.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I do recall it. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to-day, when that matter was called to his attention, said that those riots were the result of copperhead intrigues and conspiracies. That may be; but in my section of the South, after the year 1862, this system, though not resisted openly at all times, could be evaded; and I want to assure the Senators who do me the honor of their presence that the swamps of my section of the country were the sanctuaries of able-bodied men, living without habitations and as they could, to escape an enforced military service. It was not very patriotic, but it was the result of a system which all men abhorred.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the population of our neighbor on the north was very largely increased at the same time.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and for the same reasons. Desertions increased more than a hundred per cent. I have seen instances of self-mutilation of the hands and the limbs to avoid response to this system, so loathsome and repugnant was it to many of our citizens. I have known instances where provost guards entered houses with fixed bayonets and dragged their inmates away; and when they resisted they were shot. I have seen the effect of this system upon parents more than once. I have never forgotten those experiences. I never can, and I earnestly hope that they may never be repeated. I trust that this system, when adopted, will meet with a different response, as I am sure it would if it were postponed to a time when an imperiled Republic may make it absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, we very naturally look to the majority report filed by the chairman with the bill on the 19th day of April for the reasons underlying it. That report declares that this measure is necessary because it establishes "a system which

our own experience, as well as the experience of the world now in arms, has proved to be the only adequate and effectual one"; and we are also informed that "at the same time it accommodates itself to such volunteer spirit as exists and is available in the early days of the war."

Mr. President, if it be true that the experience of the world in arms has proved this to be the only adequate and effectual system for a nation's safety, let us have it by all means. I want it. But I deny that such conclusion can be truthfully drawn from the experiences of this war or any preceding one. On the contrary, I assert that it has been demonstrated beyond the power of successful contradiction that the volunteer system has not broken down in this war, but has been vindicated by it.

Much has been said in this discussion about Canada; and everything asserted regarding the success of her system of voluntary enlistments is true. She has equipped one of the greatest armies ever raised upon the Western Hemisphere by the old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon volunteer system. She has disciplined it and organized it with an efficiency, a completeness, and a dispatch so great that it has, in every encounter in which it has engaged, withstood the onslaughts of the veteran legions of the greatest military power on earth. A failure? Tell that to the people north of our boundary line! It has not, Mr. President, a solitary element of failure; for if it had, the people of the Dominion—as earnest in this war as the mother country, and as anxious to see it terminated, whose sacrifice of blood and treasure measures up to that of the mother country—would have abandoned it long ago.

In the last issue of the Survey I find an article entitled "A Canadian City in War Time." I shall not read it all; but it gives an account of the volunteer system, and ends with an interview between the writer and one of the principal officials of the Canadian Government intrusted with this work. They have there a national service board. He says:

Nothing is more ruinous than the cry for wholesale indiscriminate volunteering.

That is the argument which was so powerfully made this afternoon by the brilliant young Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Do you favor compulsion, then?

Indiscriminate compulsory service is only less bad than indiscriminate voluntary service, and compulsion is not needed if you apply modern census and efficiency methods to the process of selection. With a thousand first-class prospects in a district to work with, the process of recruiting can proceed on an entirely different plane from the old-style file-and-drum method. The atmosphere is entirely changed. The recruiting officer goes to the young man without dependents, without any special equipment to serve his country at home, with strength and youth in his favor. He asks, "Why are you not in khaki?"

I shall ask leave, Mr. President, to insert the remainder of this article as a part of my remarks, and I particularly call attention to its last paragraph, which is devoted to what is called the scientific, selective volunteer system of Canada, a system which is there worked out, and, of course, can be worked out for volunteers just as rapidly and just as effectively as can a conscript system.

The matter referred to is as follows:

As these Canadian service board men saw it, the old-fashioned way of opening a recruiting office was about as antiquated as a town crier. The modern way is more in common with the system by which a high-class insurance agency develops its prospects in any locality and an efficiency engineer deploys his human equipment once he has studied its make-up and individual prowess.

To illustrate along military lines: Recently the British Government wanted 3,000 men for the royal flying corps—acetylene welders, blacksmiths, carpenters, coppersmiths, motorcyclists, motor drivers, electricians, engine fitters, motorcycle fitters, engineers' storemen, motor fitters, millwrights, sailmakers (tallors), milling machinists, metal turners, painters, tinsmiths, cabinetmakers, vulcanizers, cooks—at pay ranging from \$1.10 to \$2.80 per day. It was an easy matter for the national service board to run through its cards and turn over to the military department 12,000 excellent prospects of men with the right training.

Similarly, in the industrial field, there was a slowing up of traffic due to lack of men to clean up locomotives in the roundhouses. It was a simple matter to put more than ample prospects in the hands of the employment agents of the Canadian railways.

In the field of agriculture the man-power inventory made it abundantly clear that there was a shortage of labor with exception of Prince Edward Island. Manitoba needed 5,000 men, Saskatchewan 5,000 and Alberta 2,500. The thing to do, as the Canadian board saw it (Washington papers please copy), was to induce 12,500 agricultural laborers to come from the United States to help in the spring work on the farms. An arrangement was completed with the provincial governments of the prairie sections by which over \$150,000 would jointly be appropriated by the Dominion and the Provinces to send 44 special agents south in cooperation with the immigration branch of the department of the interior. The plan called for the absorption of a portion of the railway fare of experienced farm hands from certain common points in the United States to the Canadian line where the cent-a-mile rate applies.

In March the second or occupational survey was initiated, schedules sent out to employers, and the cooperation of all boards of trade and industrial bodies solicited. The immediate purpose was to learn the labor needs of the essential industries, so as to make the labor resources disclosed by the man-power inventory practically available. The survey reaches deeper, however, so as to disclose opportunities for substituting

tion in the general industries, where women or partially crippled soldiers might release present employees for the essential industries or for military service.

The survey reaches further, also, and calls for estimates of employment needs following the war, so that the Government will have a clear picture of the stupendous problem of displacement which will confront the Dominion, and may develop an intelligent and nation-wide program to ease the stress when the expeditionary force and the shutting down of munitions work will put the whole social and economic structure of Canada to extraordinary test.

SCIENTIFIC SELECTIVE VOLUNTEERING.

This, then, is the system which the Dominion is developing under its national service board to approach the problem of demobilization, and which, in the view of the officials of the board, would have conserved time, resources, and efficiency in the earlier period of recruiting, such as the United States is now entering. From a social standpoint, this Canadian demonstration can scarcely be ignored by the American public. It is the answer of the great English-speaking New World democracy to the north of us to the challenge of war. Its elements are the voluntary principle as against Old World conscription; pay standards related to the current economic life of the people, far in excess of the European armies, double that of our own, supplemented by subsistence allowances which release great numbers of young married men for military service, and, with the institution of the national service board, census and efficiency methods in developing and placing recruits for the army and the essential industries. It is scientific, selective volunteering. It has conserved the liberty of conscience to the individual, and in spite of the provocation of underenlistment among the French Canadians, it has stubbornly refused to yield ground to any system of conscription which would place in the hands of the Government the power of casting armies of citizens into war without their volition. And it has mustered 400,000 volunteers—the equivalent, roughly, of a free-will army of 4,000,000 from the population of the United States.

Mr. President, a great many men have given up their lives in the Canadian Volunteer service who might have been more useful as officers, but, Mr. President, it is the flower of every country which fights the battles of democracy. In this is one of its fundamental differences from autocracy. It is the glory of free peoples everywhere that the men who come to the front industrially, socially, politically, and martially in times of war are the flower of the country, and if it were not so republics would perish from the face of the earth. The sentiment which creates and perpetuates them is the spirit which impels its sons to die for them.

That fact was noted by De Toqueville, the great French commentator upon American institutions, years ago. With the selective conscript system it is this class of men which will go to the front, do the fighting, bear the burden and the heat of the day, and their bones will strew and their blood stain the battle fields of Europe. The selective process will winnow the chaff from the wheat as unerring as the volunteering system. What has been said of Canada can be said of every other British Colony although one of them did resort to conscription and afterwards repealed the act providing for it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have heard that statement, but I do not understand that it was done in Australia.

Mr. THOMAS. I am referring to Australia.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I understand that compulsory military training has been adopted there subsequent to the repeal or modification of the act.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator may be right. I am simply giving the facts, as I read them, that the conscription act has been repealed by a popular vote. It may not be so, but with that exception if it still exists—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I think he is accurate. They had a referendum and it was rejected, as we have been told.

Mr. THOMAS. I stated it as it has reached me; but the chairman of the committee is generally very accurate in his recollection of these matters.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not the exact information, but I understood that the referendum to which the Senator refers related entirely to military service.

Mr. THOMAS. I repeat, Mr. President, that this volunteer system has been tested in all the dependencies of the British Empire, in all parts of the world with the possible exception of Australia, and has been effective and successful. Under that system the South African confederation wrested from it, every acre of soil belonging to the German Empire upon the African Continent. Her soldiers have accomplished the feat in this war of practically annihilating that part of the enemy with which they came in contact, and it was done under the volunteer system.

It may be said, and it is true, that the British-Boer war conferred an experience and a discipline upon those men which made them such effective soldiers, but there also we are confronted with the fact that this training was acquired and enjoyed by volunteers who vindicated their right to be called soldiers from the commencement to the end of the war with Great

Britain, and what is true of her dependencies is true of England also.

The report of the committee upon that subject says, on page 4:

No effectual army was raised in Great Britain until the volunteer system was abandoned and compulsory service established in its stead. Such a service was first but less effectually established by the force of enlightened and apprehensive public opinion operating in the form of social compulsion evidenced by derision, ostracism, and abuse heaped upon those who were reluctant to respond.

Again:

The British people are to-day, three years after the outbreak of the war, where they would have been at its outbreak had they been so well advised then as they are now. It would be folly for us at this late day, in the light of their experience, to begin where they began.

Mr. President, I read that twice before I could satisfy myself that it was a part of the committee report upon this all-important bill.

Mr. President, the inhabitants of Great Britain are a peace-loving nation. They are a great democracy. They are opposed to militarism in all its forms except upon the seas, where their very existence would be at all times imperiled in the absence of complete protection. They have not had a compulsory system of service until very recently. England entered into this war with a comparatively small volunteer army of veterans, who saved Paris at the Battle of the Marne. But her system, whether part compulsory or not, as here asserted and which I dispute, has been the most stupendous success, if we are to measure it by its results, in her military history.

Under that system, Mr. President, England has mobilized 5,000,000 men, drilled them, and equipped them, a force five times as large as the force whose magnitude seems to appall the Senator from New York, and did it within the short space of two years.

The majority of the committee are entirely mistaken when they assert that no effective army was raised in Great Britain until the voluntary service was abandoned and compulsory service established in its stead. In France you find the volunteer army of England. The conscripts, if I am correctly informed, are not yet ready to take the field. That magnificent body of soldiers which for the last two or three weeks have been battling by day and by night and making constant encroachments upon the enemy is England's army of volunteers. I challenge any man to contradict this statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I understood the Senator from Colorado correctly a moment ago, he said the volunteer system had been a success in the colonies with the possible exception of Australia. Will the Senator permit me to read exactly what Capt. Benson, of the British Army, said about Australia before the House committee?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The question was asked Capt. Benson:

Did you get 5,000,000 men under the volunteer system from Great Britain, not including Canada, Australia, and the other colonies?

Capt. BENSON. Yes, sir; not including any of the colonies. We got roughly about 11 per cent of the population.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do you know how many were received under the volunteer system from New Zealand, India, Australia, Canada, and the other colonies?

Capt. BENSON. I think Canada raised under the volunteer system about 400,000 men, and I think Australia and New Zealand raised, roughly, about the same number.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator just a moment there?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. While this discussion was going on a gentleman in the gallery sent down a card to me in which he stated he was informed "that good prospects for soldiers in Canada were given notice that they should enlist, and if this notice was not acted upon a discharge from employment was hinted at as likely to result." Is not this voluntary system equivalent to selective draft?

Mr. FALL. If they did enlist, they lost their job, did they not?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but in enlisting they served their country.

Mr. THOMAS. They could not very well fill two jobs so widely apart as local employment and service in the Army.

Reference has been made during this discussion to the effect that the volunteer system has been partially compulsory because men have been denounced as slackers; that the women have derided and reproached them and have refused to associate with them when they would not join the Army. It is contended that this constitutes a method of compulsion and transforms in some degree the volunteer system into a compulsory system.

Mr. President, no crusade for volunteers was ever carried on when such inducements were not a part of the propaganda.

I remember in the South, after Sumter was fired on, young men of the proper age for military service were forced by the girls of the community to enlist whenever they exhibited any reluctance to do so. They would have nothing to do with him except to reproach him, sometimes to insult him; and that pressure is something a red-blooded man can not long resist.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may interrupt the Senator, it is sometimes said that such a soldier is "nothing better than a conscript."

Mr. THOMAS. "Nothing better than a conscript." I was told that the Speaker the other day said that the people of this country regarded the conscript and convict as somewhat analogous. I do not know whether he said it or not, but I never knew a conscript to boast of it. I never knew one who voluntarily confessed it. I never knew one to acquire credit or standing because he was a conscript.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I have before me a document on the question of conscription in Australia. That question was submitted to a referendum and it was overwhelmingly defeated, and the writer says in speaking of the vote of the army on the question:

The result of the poll was a triumph for democracy, leading one to believe that no free people in the world would knowingly put themselves under the power of a military autocracy.

Sir William Irvine, a nephew of John Mitchell, the famous Irish politician, and one of the ablest men on the conscription side, had hopes to the last that the soldiers' vote would carry the day. It had been rightly decided that the Australian soldiers at the front should have their say in the matter, though a distinguished Melbourne lawyer thought it a simpler plan to add 200,000 votes to the "Yes" side, because he knew what the opinion of the soldiers would be. But to the surprise of many, who take their opinions ready-made, the soldiers voted against conscription by a huge majority. This fact was at first suppressed, but soon became an open secret.

That is, the men who were at the front bearing the brunt of the battle were unwilling that that method should be employed to force patriotic citizens to serve the country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me refer now to another statement in this majority report:

The influence of this British tradition—

That is, regarding conscription—

in this regard has brought her to the verge of national disaster in this pending gigantic struggle, which involves her life, as, indeed, it may involve ours.

Did the presence of this tradition in active form keep France from "the verge of a national disaster in this pending gigantic struggle"? Mr. President, we all know that the German Army was within 12 miles of the city of Paris when the flanking movement occurred which saved that city largely through the activities of the British Army of volunteers; and that was not only the first but the greatest disaster which has yet come to the German arms. Yet France was as near to the verge of disaster with conscription as Great Britain was near to the verge of disaster without it.

So, Mr. President, the occurrences of the war that are urged here as reasons for the attitude taken by the committee and probably by the country do not seem to be conclusive upon this question, nor as regards Great Britain do they seem to be based upon facts.

Now, there is another reason why I assert that the British volunteer system has been an immense success. Great Britain wisely postponed conscription until public opinion was ready for it. If Great Britain at the outbreak of the war had tried conscription, it would have created civil war from one end of the island to the other. Those of us who recollect the comments at that time, the apprehensions indulged in by the governing powers, the deep-seated rumblings of dissent among the great mass of the people bear out the fact that, politically independent of any other consideration, Great Britain was wise with a wisdom that almost passes understanding in postponing the day of conscription until the time when she needed all of her men and when she had secured all that were possible through the volunteer system.

I referred to the fact last Saturday that Lord Kitchener was a military commander of some experience and of great eminence, and to certain comments of his on this subject in a book recently published called "The Lord Kitchener Memorial Book." Here is a soldier to whose attention the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] is directed, who seemed to have some ideas on the volunteer system not entirely in harmony with the views of those vocal militarists who are patronizing so constantly and so frequently the telegraph companies of the country. The book to which I refer is published by George H. Doran Co., and consists of contributions from men who were close partners with Lord Kitchener in his work. Among them are Lord Derby, Sir Hedley Le Bas, who conducted the extraor-

dinary advertising campaign for recruits, that doubtless contributed largely to the success of the volunteer system. Among them is Marquis de Chasseloup Laubat—

who after November, 1914, represented the French Government at London as technical expert in the broad field of military coordination between the two Governments. In the course of many intimate conversations with Kitchener the question of recruiting naturally came up. From this point we may quote—

I am quoting from an editorial recently appearing in the New York Evening Post:

Like all men who have carefully studied the history of the French Army, he [Kitchener] knew that my father was the statesman who in 1871 and 1872 drew up the first French universal conscription law; he therefore often spoke to me of that subject, and was especially anxious to know whether I had confidential information as to the length of time the French considered necessary in 1871 for a general conscription law to produce serious results; and he was most interested when I explained to him the reasons why the answer was about 17 years.

I certainly hope if this bill is to pass that the efficiency we are looking for will materialize long before the lapse of 17 years. I would like to live to see it, and 17 years from now conscription will have very little interest for me.

From what he told me he seems to have come to the conclusion that in England conscription must necessarily come sooner or later—but the later the better.

On the whole, it seems that Kitchener and the British Government acted wisely—

He is still giving his conversations with Kitchener—

in not hurriedly taking a step of which the premature adoption might have brought many more and far greater evil results than good.

Let me reread into the RECORD what this great military genius said on the floor of the House of Lords on January 5, 1916, upon this subject:

So far we have been able to provide for the largest increase of the army and its maintenance on a purely voluntary system, and I, personally, had always hoped that we should be able to finish the war successfully without changing that system, which has done so well and which has given us such splendid material in the field. I do not consider that the change proposed should be regarded in the light of any derogation of the principle of voluntary service in this country. It only affects, during the period of the war, one class of men, among whom there are undoubtedly a certain number who have but a poor idea of their duties as citizens.

On May 23 Kitchener said in the House of Lords:

The conviction is deeply and universally felt that we have engaged in a just war, and the patriotism of our people gave us, under the voluntary system, a far larger army than we could ever have contemplated. This bill will enable us to maintain its numbers in a manner and degree not hitherto possible.

Mr. President, I can reach no other than the conclusion that Lord Kitchener was satisfied with the volunteer system up to the time when it became necessary to supplement it with the draft. You can not condemn a system so long as it is good, nor can you resort to something else on the plea of necessity until that element appears. Then the new departure should be used to supplement existing conditions.

Before the Senate adjourns let me quote another character of some military prominence in his day and generation. I now refer to Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, who wrote and published his Memoirs. On page 386 of the second volume, beginning at the bottom of the page, he says:

But the real difficulty was, and will be again, to obtain an adequate number of good soldiers. We tried almost every system known to modern nations, all with more or less success—voluntary enlistments, the draft, and bought substitutes—and I think that all officers of experience will confirm my assertion that the men who voluntarily enlisted at the outbreak of the war were the best—better than the conscript and far better than the bought substitute. When a regiment is once organized in a State and mustered into the service of the United States the officers and men become subject to the same laws of discipline and government as the Regular troops. They are in no sense "militia," but compose a part of the Army of the United States, only retain their State titles for convenience, and yet may be principally recruited from the neighborhood of their original organization. Once organized, the regiment should be kept full by recruits, and when it becomes difficult to obtain more recruits the pay should be raised by Congress instead of tempting new men by exaggerated bounties. I believe it would have been more economical to have raised the pay of the soldier to thirty or even fifty dollars a month than to have held out the promise of three hundred and even six hundred dollars in the form of bounty.

Here comes the slacker—

Toward the close of the war I have often heard the soldiers complain that the "stay-at-home" men got better pay, bounties, and food than they, who were exposed to all the dangers and vicissitudes of the battles and marches at the front. The feeling of the soldier should be that in every event the sympathy and preference of his Government is for him who fights rather than for him who is on provost or guard duty to the rear; and, like most men, he measures this by the amount of pay. Of course, the soldier must be trained to obedience and should be "content with his wages"; but whoever has commanded an army in the field knows the difference between a willing, contented mass of men and one that feels a cause of grievance.

Now, listen to this conclusion:

There is a soul to an army as well as to the individual man, and no general can accomplish the full work of his army unless he commands the soul of his men as well as their bodies and legs.

That is true, Mr. President. It explains the superiority of the volunteer to the conscript. You can not transmute reluctant and unwilling service into that spiritual enthusiasm which glows with fervor and sacrifice in the camp as on the battle field. Germany can, under her despotic and inflexible methods, grind the man to powder, break his will, reduce him to the level of the slave, and turn out a dull automaton, obeying orders and yielding the obedience of a dog to a brutal master, but that can not be done here yet. No such soldiers can defend a Republic. But, if the conscript system comes, such methods must come with it sooner or later, and the volunteer soldier will have disappeared forever.

Just one more reference this afternoon, Mr. President. I want to quote Gen. Miles in this connection, one of the greatest soldiers of his time, and to read an extract which I find on page 52 of the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs on the volunteer and conscription systems:

Mr. GORDON. You are opposed to compulsory service?

Gen. MILES. Absolutely.

Mr. GORDON. Do you believe that we can raise 133,000 men each year for three years for the continental Army without compulsion?

Gen. MILES. With compulsion, I hope not. I think it would be a very dangerous step toward centralization. As far as conscription was concerned, that was tried out during the Civil War, with unsatisfactory results. I think there were 54,000 men added to the Army—54,000 additional to the 2,000,000 men—by conscription, but I know that, just at the time of the crisis of the Gettysburg campaign, thousands of the best troops, drilled and disciplined men in the Army, had to be taken out of the field and sent back to suppress the riots occasioned by that unpopular measure. Approximately 10,000 or 12,000 were ordered to New York, and I know that there was a brigade in Pennsylvania, which was organized at Huntingdon, and, instead of being sent to the field where they were needed, they were sent to Philadelphia to maintain order. It was a very unpopular measure at that time in that great crisis of the Nation.

Tuesday, April 24, 1917.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, just before the recess of yesterday I read quotations from the memoirs of Gen. Sherman and the testimony of Gen. Miles regarding the subject now under consideration. I shall supplement them with one from Maj. Gen. Sir Sam Hughes, with whose career we are all familiar. He was intrusted with the duty of securing, training, and equipping volunteers for active service upon the Continent.

On the 16th of April of last year, in a statement published in the New York Times Current History upon this subject, Gen. Hughes said:

What Canada is doing is raising a trained democratic army. Both of the adjectives I have just used—"trained" and "democratic"—are of the utmost importance in understanding this situation. Our strength up to a million and three-quarters of men, if necessary, will be in a volunteer army of citizens, every man trained in modern methods of warfare. And the lesson of all history is that the democratic army, after it gets its bearings, always defeats the standing army of professionals. One-third of the army that won the battle of Waterloo was made up of farmers. We have farmers, fishermen, lumbermen, hunters, Indians, thousands of keen athletic young fellows from the cities, and big student delegations from the universities—all the elements needed for the army that wins.

Mr. President, that confirms De Toqueville's comment upon democratic armies, that the longer they exist the more efficient they become, and unless conquered early in the conflict they become invincible.

Gen. Hughes continues:

RICH AND POOR BOTH COME FORWARD.

There is nothing to complain about, and we can not say that this or that element in the population is hanging back. The rich and the poor, the French and the English Canadian, and even the Indian, are all coming out to help Canada and the rest of civilization.

The response is so loyal and spontaneous that, as I have already told you, the new men are enlisting at the rate of a thousand a day for the entire Dominion.

Mr. President, the views of Mr. Roosevelt upon this subject, whether convincing or not, are of some interest. In a letter published on the 16th of April, giving his indorsement to the program of conscription, he said:

Many months, probably at least a year or more, must elapse before the army thus raised would be available for use in Europe in the hard, aggressive fighting campaigns which it is honorably incumbent on us to undertake. Now that we have entered into the war.

He is entirely within bounds in assuming that an army raised by the selective draft, and equally true of an army raised in any other way, will require a year if not more to train and equip it for active service in the field.

Meanwhile—

Says Mr. Roosevelt—

let us use volunteer forces in connection with a portion of the Regular Army, in order at the earliest possible moment, within a few months, to put our flag on the firing line.

Now, that suggestion is precisely what the opponents of this bill are endeavoring to effect. Our motives are challenged, our sincerity is questioned, our patriotism is denied, because of our insistence upon a recognition of American methods in the raising of this great number of troops. Yet this gentleman, who ap-

parently agrees with us very cordially, has encountered no criticism from our noisy civil experts on military policies.

Now, why does Mr. Roosevelt think that while waiting for a conscript army to be whipped into condition we should invoke the volunteer system for the purpose of raising an army to be immediately utilized.

We owe this to humanity—

I read again from Roosevelt's statement—

We owe it to the small nations who have suffered such dreadful wrong from Germany. Most of all, we owe it to ourselves, to our national honor and self-respect.

We do not go so far as this. We advocate the old system because it is American, because it is the system of free men and not of slaves, because it has never failed us during the earlier stages of warfare, and because it is democratic.

But Mr. Roosevelt wants to put the flag on the firing line immediately and perceives the necessity of doing it with volunteer forces if it is to be done at once.

"For the sake of our own souls and the memories of the great Americans of the past we must show that we do not intend to make this merely a dollar war. Let us pay with our bodies for our souls' desire. Let us without one hour's unnecessary delay put the American flag on the battle front in this great world war for democracy and civilization and for the reign of justice and fair dealing among the nations of mankind."

The colonel said he did not seek to have the volunteer system interfere in any way with or substitute for the obligatory plan, but that, except in certain cases, the volunteers should be composed of men who would not be taken under obligatory service.

He proposes an amendment to the act of March 7, 1899, providing for the raising of 35,000 volunteers. He is evidently unfamiliar with or has forgotten the act of 1914. He proposes an amendment—

So as to authorize the President to raise a force of not more than 100,000 (or 200,000 to 500,000 later) for three years or the duration of the war.

"Under this act," the letter continued, "I should ask leave to raise for immediate service overseas with the first expeditionary force an infantry division of three-regiment brigades and one divisional brigade of Cavalry, together with an Artillery brigade, a regiment of engineers, a motorcycle, machine-gun regiment, an aero squadron, a signal corps, the supply service, etc."

"I should request the War Department for the detail of, say, two officers for every 1,000 men."

Of course the colonel would do the commanding himself.

"I believe that, acting under the direction and with the aid of the department, I could raise the division and have it ready to begin shipment to France in two or three months. My idea would be to have the intensive training in gas work, bomb throwing, bayonet fighting, and trench work given in France; they would then be sent into the trenches when they were thoroughly prepared."

Mr. President, if that is a praiseworthy, patriotic suggestion, I wish some one would explain to me the difference between it and the thing for which we are contending, which is that for present exigencies a test should be had of our old acceptable American volunteer system, resort being had to the other system when this shall prove a failure either in whole or in part.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Colorado has read as an utterance of Col. Roosevelt. Can the Senator inform me what has become of that proposition of Col. Roosevelt?

Mr. THOMAS. I know nothing about it. I have seen little comment upon it. I do not think that any offers—and a number of them have come through me—of men under the volunteer system have been entertained or considered.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I have understood—I may be incorrectly informed—that proposition of Col. Roosevelt has been practically refused.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the Senator is probably right; but, Mr. President, behind and beneath it is the fact, which Col. Roosevelt instinctively recognizes, that, after all, the soldier who does the fighting is the man, to use Gen. Sherman's expression, whose soul is in the business; and I venture the prediction that when this bill becomes a law its practical operation will, if successful, be the equivalent of the volunteer system. The man who wants to fight, the man who proposes to fight, the man who believes it to be his duty to fight, will be the man to whom this selective system, so called, will ultimately apply, and especially in view of the conceded fact that we actually need but a very small percentage of the men who will be subject to the operation of this draft within the limit of age for which it provides.

Mr. President, I might say much more against the proposition that the volunteer system has not proven the failure in this war that is contended by the advocates of this bill. Let me now turn, however, to what is said in the majority report of the committee regarding the draft which was resorted to by both sides during the Civil War:

It was half a century—

This is a quotation from Gen. Upton—

It was half a century later that we reaped the bitter fruits of this system at the Battle of Bull Run.

What system? The volunteer system. Who reaped "the bitter fruits" of it? The Northern Army. Did it not bring triumphant success to the volunteer army of the South? In battle the reaping of "bitter fruits" means the garnering of rich and luscious ones by the enemy. To assert that because an army of volunteers representing one section of the country overcame an army of volunteers representing the other section is a condemnation of the volunteer system is to invoke a process of logic which, I confess, I am unable to understand. I deny that the result of the early battles of the Civil War militates either for or against the system, for the very obvious reason that the one thing common to both sections of the country was the volunteer system in full operation.

That battle—

Says the report—

the first of the war, though it should have contributed much, contributed nothing whatever to the decision, and this for the very reason which so unnecessarily prolonged that struggle, namely, the incompetence of those placed in command by the volunteer method.

Mr. President, I concede that the man who is trained to arms is presumptively superior in that profession to the man who is not so trained; and yet it is the history of every volunteer system the world ever knew that military genius has been disclosed and developed to the highest degree among volunteer officers. The long list of distinguished commanders whom I might mention, the fruit of the terrible Civil War in America, demonstrates that through the crucible of conflict, through the active service upon the battle field and in the camp, comes the development of volunteer officers and volunteer soldiers alike. I do not go to extremes when I declare that the volunteer commanders of the Civil War who achieved distinction and honor and glory on both sides are quite as numerous and as conspicuous as those of the Regular Army.

The truth is—

Says this report—

The truth is the volunteer system and the State method of recruiting it, which seems to be a necessary concomitant of it, throughout the war proved such a failure to Union arms that it could not have been disastrous in the face of an enemy better prepared than were the Confederates or with a better system.

That, I think, Mr. President, is obvious; that is to say, a poor system in conflict with a better system has a disadvantage which may result in defeat; but it is no historic argument in favor of or against the system which some of us think should not be discarded by this bill, and which, when discarded, will in all probability be discarded forever. Moreover it should be borne in mind that had the North been represented at Bull Run by an army of conscripts, the result would have been no different. The troops would have been just as raw, just as unfit, and just as unsuccessful.

In the South the volunteer system was continued after 1862 concurrently with the so-called conscriptive system. Men raised companies and regiments and brigades through their personal efforts just as before, inspired, of course, by the ambition to command. It was the concurrent operation of the volunteer system which kept the armies of the Confederacy equipped with man power. And for two years, Mr. President, after every resource of that country was exhausted, shut off from the world by the most complete system of blockade known to the military history of the world, the Confederacy was able to continue the conflict because of the heroism and sacrifice and sense of duty animating the breasts and the consciences of its volunteer armies. If the experiment of the draft in the South proves anything, it is that in a country like ours it is a somewhat hazardous experiment.

Let me read an extract from the report of the Confederate bureau of conscription in 1864:

A rigid and unusual inspection, not only of company rolls but personal and also pay rolls, will prove that more men have been received into the service irregularly—that is, by volunteering—since the 1st of January than have gone through the conscription authorities.

In many localities it has been found expedient, indeed necessary, to suspend wholly or partially the operation of conscriptions. This has been done in localities between the lines of our armies and those of the enemy—so far as the reserve classes are concerned—for obvious reasons of preventing those classes from becoming prisoners of war.

Mr. President, I quoted Gen. Miles yesterday partly for the purpose of showing the small number of troops obtained under the operation of the conscript law of the North. In 1866 Provost Marshal General James B. Fry made a report, which, after referring to the violent disturbances in many portions of the country and the bloodshed accompanying the attempted enforcement of the law, says:

The draft was not completed till late in the year—

Presumably that year—

and produced but few men for the service.

And I am informed that Gen. Miles's computation of 53,000 men secured by the draft is entirely too high. The actual number was less than 50,000. So that, Mr. President, we derive but little intelligent information from a study of the conscript experiments of our own Civil War. If it tends to prove anything it is that they were failures.

Reference has been made to the Spanish War. At that time, Mr. President, the conscripting of men was not mentioned, was not considered, was not thought of. Why? Because through the spur and spirit of adventure the young men of the country flocked to the standard of the Nation in overwhelming numbers and to a far greater extent than were needed. What that war did develop was the incompetency of the War Department in meeting a sudden emergency. What it did develop was the folly of attempting to use troops that were not troops at all beyond their oaths of allegiance. These were mobilized for active service without training. They were unfit for service. If these volunteers had been conscripts, under the existing conditions the result would have been precisely the same. You can not make a soldier out of a recruit in a moment, whether he volunteers or is conscripted. The element of training in either event is an absolute essential and the time required for it is not affected.

Some people assume—at least their statements involve the impression—the presence of some chemical or mental or physical element about conscription, which when applied to the average citizen instantly transforms him into a veteran, whereas the volunteer, being innocuous to such influences because he is a volunteer, must undergo a long process of training to become a soldier. If Col. Roosevelt is a military authority—and he claims to be an authority upon everything on earth—then I must conclude that his demand that pending the operation of this conscript law we should use the volunteer system, necessarily implies that the class of men whom he would thus obtain would be more susceptible to discipline and more easily and rapidly trained than would the average American, and that for the accomplishment of one of the main purposes involved in this war we should use the two *pari passu*, and that is what we are contending for.

I have heard it claimed in the committee room that universal service is an American policy as outlined by the act of 1792. That act, Mr. President, does recognize, and very properly so, the obligation of every citizen to serve his country and, within certain ages, to submit to military training; but no one will pretend that that law was enforced or that any attempt was made to enforce it. Why? Because the spirit, the traditions, and the genius of the American people were in conflict with it; because the attempt to enforce it would have instantly brought to the front the identical conditions against which the Revolutionary soldiers fought. A significant element of that bill, which is not mentioned very often, is the authority to the States to make such exemptions from its operation as they might see fit, a condition which, of course, destroyed the effectiveness of the law, and that must have been known to those who in enacting the law allowed it to contain such an exemption. So that, Mr. President, if that statute is at all pertinent to the discussion, it is that it was so out of touch with the prevailing views and opinions of the people at that time that no attempt was made to enforce it. That may have been a misfortune; we may otherwise have inculcated a military spirit in the generations which have occupied the field of action between that time and the present; but the fact remains that a law more than 100 years old, now resurrected to show that this new policy has always been ours, certainly shows the desperation of its advocates, since it is conceded that the statute was a dead letter from its enactment.

Mr. President, there is much force in the reminder that we should not imitate the mistakes of Great Britain; that her blunders should be a warning to us, and we should avoid them wherever possible. That is good advice. We can have no better counsel from any direction. I sought to show—and to my own satisfaction, at least, I did show—yesterday that England made no mistake in testing her voluntary system to the full; that she made no mistake in postponing resort to conscription until the minds and consciences of the people had been educated through experience to the belief in its final necessity as a supplement to the volunteer system then in vogue. I hope that we will, as far as possible, avoid every blunder with which the experiences of that great people have been punctuated during the past two years and a half, and that we will be able to do so very largely if we study dispassionately the history of these times and find what were and what were not the blunders of her policy.

But, Mr. President, should we not imitate her successes while avoiding her mistakes? Has she not taught us something in the field of active and successful effort equally as valuable to us if we heed it, as the need for ascertaining her blunders and avoiding them? What was England's first act of military policy after war was declared? Did she not take possession of every line of transportation? Did she not assume control of her railroads and water communications, making them all subservient to her great need of national defense? And was it not the supreme demand of a great crisis? Has anyone here, has any advocate of conscription, even suggested that the United States heed this most successful step in war administration? I have not heard it.

Mr. President, during the hearings on the military training law this subject came up in connection with the testimony of Col. Lydecker. Let me refer to that testimony for a moment. The colonel said, and said very properly:

The question for you is, How are you going to arrange the military defense of the country by the utilization of the militia? You are first to prepare your Regular Army, and it is a very costly thing to do. The Regular Army must be the center of organization of all military force and strength in regard to the five elements that relate to the subject of war.

He then states these five elements, each of which is absolutely and essentially important to preparation, either for defense or for offense.

The five elements I perhaps need not repeat here, but the five things that must be attended to in order to prosecute war successfully are—

And he puts this first—

the transportation, the material, the instruments of destruction, the instruments for medication and care of the sick and wounded, and then the masses of men who make up the fighting strength. These are the five things that must be required by every nation for preparation for defense or for war.

And that is the experience of every writer upon military affairs of whom I have any knowledge.

I then asked the colonel—reading now from page 415:

Would you extend that general control to the five essential elements of military defense to which you referred a few moments ago, including transportation?

Col. LYDECKER. No, sir; I would not. I have been brought up under a democracy, and I am a Democrat. I do not believe yet in Federal ownership of the railroads—

Mind, the question had nothing to do with ownership—

the telegraph, or the other public utilities. I do not believe in it yet. The country may be socialized to the point where it would be necessary to do so, but I do not believe in that. I do not believe in a military autocracy. I do not believe in the Federal authorities owning the railroads until war begins, and then they should take them under full power, and the military authorities should have full control and run the railroads through such sections as it is necessary to properly control the transportation.

The colonel believed that after war begins this should be the policy. Has anybody heard a suggestion of such a policy from any source, either before or after we entered this war? On the contrary, we are asked to increase the toll of these great transportation companies upon the consuming millions of the country by permitting them to raise their rate for transportation from 5 to 15 per cent. Mr. President, if we are to prepare for war, let us prepare. As the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] so well said, we are in this fight, so let us fight. Let us not forget that everything necessary to success in this war may depend upon transportation; and we know that when it is in the hands of private corporations, they very naturally and very properly operate the roads to earn money, thus enabling them to pay a profit to shareholders. That is right; but, Mr. President, it is superior to the military necessity in their minds at all times, whether they are conscious of it or not. It is perfectly legitimate, but it would not influence the Government in war times beyond the need for supplying the people with life's necessities. In private hands, however, the public needs are essentially secondary to the usual demands of traffic.

I heard some time ago of a consignment of horses from Cheyenne, needed on the Mexican border for men ready to mount and use them, which were sent first to New York by the railroad companies and then forwarded to the border. I have wondered whether Uncle Sam paid the freight first from Cheyenne to New York, and then from New York to the border. I am not a betting man, but I should be inclined to wager that the bill was presented for that transportation, in any event. This is an instance of results that must follow from the competition of civic and commercial needs and necessities and the imperative requirements of the Government.

I am in favor of compulsory service when required, and the public needs demand as a military step full governmental control of the transportation and the intelligence companies of the country, comprising the railroads, the telephone and the tele-

graph companies, and the vessels conducting traffic upon our waterways. The Government has commandeered wireless telegraphy, and no reason can be assigned for it that does not justify the extension of the policy to the telephone and telegraph lines of the country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator will remember that the very proposition he is now discussing was before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the very amendment that the Senator suggests was adopted by the committee and finally enacted by Congress, authorizing the Government, in case of necessity, to take charge of and operate these public utilities.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I well remember, Mr. President, that in the defense act of last year that matter was up, and if I recall aright I was the author of the amendment to which the Senator refers; but it was not enacted as I offered it. It does not provide for the seizure of all of these lines of communication, which Col. Lydecker says, and all military writers say, is one of the five prerequisites to a sensible, full, military preparation. That is what I think should be done. I know that we are at war, and I know that it is necessary to do whatever we can—keeping in mind always the rights of the people, and the effect upon those rights of hastily considered legislation—to meet this crisis as it should be met.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado further yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does not the Senator think that under that very provision which was enacted by Congress, when the emergency does arise, when the railroads are needed by the Government, it can take charge of them?

Mr. THOMAS. I think so; I also think the emergency confronts us; but unfortunately the Senator knows when you leave the matter to the discretion of functionaries the emergency is seldom if ever recognized. The emergency is here, and we are told that we should follow the experience of other nations and avoid their mistakes. We should also imitate their successes. We should do exactly as Great Britain and France did—not wait for any other than the overwhelming, present, all-pervading emergency—and act accordingly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield; yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator advocating now the policy of taking over the railroads at this time and operating them?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I am. We are at war. Military authorities say that the control of transportation is necessary. Col. Lydecker declared that when war was on, he thought it ought to be done.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What would the Senator expect to obtain from such operation which the country does not now obtain?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should expect to obtain first just what was obtained in England, the abolition of the numberless discriminations through the exercise of which the prices of the necessities of life are soaring beyond the reach of the average man. I should expect the Government to give equal rates and equal rights to all, just as was done in Great Britain. I should expect benefit to result through the discipline of the men, for they, like conscripts or volunteers, must also be trained to the arts of war; and I should expect scores of engineers to be at work determining where new lines should be constructed to prevent possible calamities upon our coast, which is now not so well provided. I should expect the disappearance and destruction of these gambling enterprises, which in times like these flourish upon the needs of the people through combinations which succeed through juggled transportation rates. I should expect, too, Mr. President, that through this operation the Government would make due compensation to the owners of the railroads, based upon the actual value of their property, just as they are doing in Great Britain.

I read some time ago in the New York Times Supplement an article written by an Englishman which described the admirable improvements in service and benefits in rates resulting to all the people of the British Isles through Government regulation and control of transportation, and which concluded with the statement that when this war ended popular sentiment would compel the Government to continue that control and operation in the interest—the commercial interest, the social

interest, the industrial interest—of all the people. That may be one reason why we can not do it. Here, as there, the inestimable and far-reaching superiority of Government over private control will create a similar public sentiment irresistible and nation compelling, under the operation of which these essential elements of modern commercial and social life would be permanently taken over by the Government.

Mr. President, we are told that we should help the allies all we can. I agree to that. I do not violate any of the proprieties, certainly no confidences, when I assert that what France needs now is not men; her man power is still ample. What she needs are supplies and credits; and we should arrange to give them both in ample amount and bend our energies to the one effort—to the principal effort—of raising and manufacturing supplies and building ships.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. What did Lloyd-George say the other day was the crying need from this country? First, ships; second, ships; and third, ships. Mr. President, in the repetition of that word he voiced what we know to be the one supreme need of this war in view of Germany's submarine warfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. KELLOGG. What authority has the Senator from Colorado for the statement that France does not need men now, as against the statement of her public men and other public men of England that she does need them?

Mr. THOMAS. I have the authority of similar statements, of the fact that we are informed from time to time of the number of men at the front. You can not use two or three men where only one is needed. Of course, I do not wish to have my position misunderstood. I am not saying that we should not proceed to raise an Army. Yes; by all means let us do it, and do it expeditiously. I am simply calling attention to other things which, in the course of our preparation, seem to me to be equally and in some matters more important. Of course, we are responding. It is proposed to build ships everywhere. God grant that we may do it. I hope some system may be devised whereby different parts may be constructed in different sections of the country and assembled upon the seacoast. There are other good things about England's defenses which we might well imitate, but I will not now recount them.

Now, Mr. President, a few words with regard to the details of this bill. I have contended—with what success I do not know—that the same inequalities and defects which are observable in the volunteer system and for which it is condemned will appear under this system until the public need requires all of our man power. That was true during the Civil War. I think it is true now. It is said that we need but a small percentage of our man power, and that calls into activity what is called the selective element of this bill. The mere exercise of the selective power reveals the presence of inequality. As provided in the bill it stops with the process of exclusion.

It may be that I have misread the bill, and that it does what I now criticize; but if it provided that all men between given ages should be unconditionally subject to the law, and that in the processes of selection those not needed for soldiers should be assigned to and compelled to serve in other branches of activity—on the farms, in the factories, upon the railroads, and in those other vocations which are a part of the Nation's preparedness—it would fulfill one idea of universal service; but it does not. The exercise of this so-called selective system—and if I am wrong I hope the chairman will correct me—begins and ends with naming those who are to enlist and those who are not. The man who is excused is excused without limitation or condition. He goes back to the thing which he was doing, and to idleness if he was doing nothing. He may abandon the thing he was doing, although the doing of it was the cause of his rejection. Now, I can conceive of no virtue in such a selective process, and all can perceive that sense of injustice and inequality which will inevitably arise in the breasts of those and their relatives who are required to go because of that discrimination by the military authorities, which conscripts him and dismisses his neighbor. If, on the contrary, the man excused from service was at once drafted into something useful and necessary, because he was skilled in the art to which he was assigned, they would not entertain, to the same degree at least, that feeling of unjust discrimination which ripens into discontent and impairs the morale of the soldier.

I can not find in this bill anything which establishes that system which I understand to be the English system now and which we are supposedly imitating. Now, that is precisely the volunteer service as its opponents contend. What difference does it

make to the man who serves whether the slacker of whom he complains is a slacker by his own volition or by the direction of the Government? Does it not produce the same feeling of inequality? How, then, are you going to avoid by the enactment of this bill the very thing which is contended for as the fundamental difference between the draft and the volunteer system? You can not do it.

Let me turn for a moment, Mr. President, to the exemptions in this bill—and I shall run over them as hurriedly as possible.

The civil officers and employees of the United States are exempted. It is then declared that—

Nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well-organized religious sect or organization, at present organized and existing, whose creed forbids its members to participate in war in any form and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed of said religious organization.

There, Mr. President, is an exemption which is rank injustice. Why should those entertaining convictions against war be divided into those who belong to denominations and those who do not? How will this exemption operate? Let me illustrate. I will suppose that my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois has a son within the age covered by this bill. He does not belong to any church or religious denomination, but all his convictions are against service in war. They are as deep-seated and as profound as those of any church member in the world; yet he must go into the ranks. My friend from Utah has a son possessed of the same convictions and affiliates with a sect or organization whose creed forbids its members to participate in war. He is exempted from military service; not because of his convictions, but because of his church connection. Does the history of the volunteer service reveal any discrimination more monstrous than this?

I do not believe, Mr. President, if you are to have universal service, we should make any exemptions at all except public officials of States and the Nation and the mentally and physically unfit. I do not believe that in universal service a man should be exempted because he thinks war a horrible thing any more than the man who does not think so. Each is a citizen, invested with a citizen's duties. Exemptions like these breed hypocrisy and falsehood. But if you are going to make this exemption, be just and include all whose consciences prohibit their participation in acts of war, in bloodshed, in militarism, whether defensive or offensive, and do not limit your exemption to those who are fortunate enough to be identified with some religious denomination of similar creed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have in mind to ask the Senator from Colorado more than one question with regard to the section which he is now considering and which I think is radically wrong, as I shall endeavor to point out at some future time, although I am not opposed to conscription; but the thing I now desire to ask the Senator from Colorado, who is a member of the Military Committee, is this: Why did the committee adopt—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator by saying that illness prevented me from attending the meetings of the committee on this bill, save one, and consequently I wish he would address himself to those who are more familiar with its details.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will address myself directly to the judgment of the Senator from Colorado. The military service act of Great Britain adopts an entirely different criterion upon the point being discussed by the Senator from Colorado, and permits an individual whose conscientious scruples against fighting or against combative service to be relieved. I call that to the attention of the Senator from Colorado to emphasize what he just said about the injustice and apparent want of necessity of requiring that the man who is to be relieved shall belong to a religious organization whose creed is opposed to fighting. Great Britain has not adopted any such criterion.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I have stated that I could not conceive any reason for the distinction. There may be a practical one.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The language in the bill is the language which has been in every military bill that has been enacted since colonial days. I think it was first used during the War of 1812. The other proposition of exempting an individual who has conscientious scruples against serving was not brought to the attention of the committee, as I remember

it, and the committee followed the language that has been used always in military legislation in this country.

As the Senator says, the military act of Great Britain does provide for individuals who have conscientious scruples, and it provides a tribunal which shall determine as to the justice or the reasonableness of the claim of the individual. That might not be a bad idea in this bill, but Senators and Members in Congress insist on following tradition and following the precedents heretofore established in this legislation, and the committee did that in this bill. It may not be broad enough, but that was what moved the committee to adopt the language which has been discussed in Congress for years, and which was finally crystallized in the statutes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to hear what the Senator has said, but I supposed we were attempting to profit by the wisdom of Great Britain and France and other countries.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, measurably; but we did not have those acts before us when the bill was prepared. I will say to the Senator with reference to the selective draft that there must be some method of selection, because there are, perhaps, 6,000,000 men who would be subject to the draft in this country. We are not liable to need that number of men now. Under the volunteer system they would go out from the factories and the fields and farms, from the industrial plants and from behind counters. That has been the history of all countries. Patriotic young men would enter the Army and cripple the industrial life of the country.

The purpose of this selective proposition was to leave those men in groups behind. They are to be drafted into the service as well as anybody else. The President will say, under the regulations prepared, "Here is a group of men engaged in munitions factories who shall be exempted; they are serving their country when they stay at their forges and do the work the country needs." So it is with other groups of individuals who may be needed in industrial life. I have heard it said on the floor of the Senate, but I forget, how many hundreds of thousands of men went from the factories and munitions plants and other industrial life in Great Britain who were finally brought from the trenches and put back into the industrial life to manufacture the very munitions and clothing which the troops needed. Those men were thus doing just as much for their country, and probably more, than the men in the trenches themselves.

Mr. CUMMINS. Ought not their compensation to be reduced to \$15 a month, then, during the war?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is aside from the question. If I had my way, in time of war every man would serve his country for nothing—not only the enlisted men but the officers as well. That gets away from the idea of a mercenary army and puts everybody on the volunteer system. If I had my way, I would make them serve and let the Government keep them, and give them nothing for it; but I will not have my way. In all human probability Congress, instead of placing all on an equality of maintenance and support while serving the Government, will raise the pay of all.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS. I am very anxious to get through. I want to be as courteous to these Senators—

Mr. FALL. I simply want to ask the Senator from Oregon a question, in view of his statement.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. As it is necessary to encourage some of these men who serve their country in munitions factories, would he apply the same rule of nonpayment to a man in a munitions factory that he would apply, if he had his way, to the man in the ranks?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hardly think so, Mr. President.

Mr. FALL. Why not, if one is to be called and the other is left, and they are to render equal service to their country? The Senator would not allow anything to the man who is offering his life. Why should he allow anything to the man who is simply giving the work of his hands?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The man who is working in the industrial plant, unless the Government is operating it, is supposed to be making a profit for the owners.

Mr. FALL. Then I would go further than the Senator, if necessary, and commandeer the plants and take the profits, or see that there were none.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It may come to a point where that will have to be done.

Mr. FALL. If we are going to have nonpayment for work let us commence there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator, if the Government has to commandeer these plants I do not see why they should not be placed on the same basis.

Mr. FALL. I am not indulging in heroics, but I am willing to serve without my salary as a Member of Congress if the Senator will join me, providing that other people also in the service of their country shall also surrender their emoluments and pay.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am willing to measure my patriotism with that of the Senator from New Mexico. Whenever the Senator—

Mr. FALL. I have no reflection to make upon the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall here insert the exemption clauses of the British military act, exclusive of the procedure for their operation:

CERTIFICATES OF EXEMPTION.

2. (1) An application may be made at any time before the appointed date to the local tribunal established under this act by or in respect of any man for the issue to him of a certificate of exemption from the provisions of this act—

(a) On the ground that it is expedient in the national interests that he should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged or in which he wishes to be engaged or, if he is being educated or trained for any work, that he should continue to be so educated or trained; or

(b) On the ground that serious hardship would ensue, if the man were called up for army service, owing to his exceptional financial or business obligations or domestic position; or

(c) On the ground of ill-health or infirmity; or

(d) On the ground of a conscientious objection to the undertaking of combatant service.

Of course, I understand that the exemption to which I was addressing myself when interrupted is a rescript of former statutes. But as we are getting away from tradition I see no reason why, when we burn our bridges behind us, we should not keep pressing forward and give the man having conscientious scruples outside of a church the same consideration as the man having the same conscientious scruples inside of a church.

Now, let me refer briefly to some of the other exemptions. The original bill, what is called the committee print, is precisely that of the bill reported, except that the exemptions of all persons engaged in agriculture were not mentioned. That was inserted by the committee, and the Senate will notice that it is without limitation as to the class. Everybody engaged in agriculture may be exempt if the authorities see fit in this proposed scheme of universal service to say so. And they need not require the farmers to continue their pursuit after the exemption. I do not know why this far-reaching exemption was inserted, unless to placate the farmers of the Nation. That might quiet their opposition, but it is not fair to the balance of the Nation who remain subject to the provisions of the law, nor do I think it is fair that they should enjoy especial privileges in a time of great emergency. It is not fair to the agricultural community, because if the son of John Jones, farmer, is exempted, and the son of Reuben Jones, farmer, is conscripted, there is an inequality as glaring, if not more so, than any that you can detect in the volunteer system. Why should a partial selection be made from an entire industrial interest, perhaps the largest in the country, which may be excused in toto if the President shall so determine? Will you excuse those raising wheat and conscript those raising corn? Will you make selections from both? How shall you exercise the right of selection so that he who is called may not curse you for choosing him and relieving his neighbor's boy?

I can not reconcile these provisions, Mr. President, with what is said to be the purpose and the object of the bill. To my mind they are replete with trouble, with far-reaching trouble, the certain outgrowth of that discrimination to flow from the fact that we need but a small percentage of the men who will be subject to this law, and especially when we consider that there is nothing in the bill which authorizes the Government after a man has been exempted to draft him for the pursuit in which he is engaged or to compel him to take up some other and as a conscript contribute his service to the common cause.

It is true the volunteer system produces the inequalities to which the Senator refers, but the selective principle can be applied to the volunteer system of enlistments quite as readily as it can to any other. Canada is doing so. It should always be done, except where the entire force of the Nation coming within the age limit is required for military duty.

But I must proceed. Among those who are subject to exemption are "the physically and morally deficient." We have heard much about the slackers. The term has become one of reproach. In many instances it is justified and in many more it is not. Nevertheless it is a term of reproach. Is the slacker morally deficient? Who are the morally deficient? Can any man answer? Will any two men give the same definition? A

man who can without any injury to himself enlist and does not do so when his country needs him is morally deficient in the opinion of many. We can mention many other classes of moral deficiencies. We are told—and I think it is true—that it is, generally speaking, the morally deficient who do not enlist, except from a spirit of adventure or where the probabilities for its speedy gratification are great. But under the provisions of this act, if it becomes a law, the very classes it is designed to reach can be exempted from the operation of its provisions. And the so-called slacker will escape anyhow. I venture the assertion, so far as the morally deficient are concerned, there are more of them beyond than below the age of 25 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I simply want to ask the Senator from Colorado if the conscription plan is put into effect why not remove the entire age limit and make a selection from conscripts everywhere and allow them to go on the pay roll when they are called to duty. I would say that I would favor a plan of that kind myself, using reasonable judgment in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not care to discuss that, because it has been referred to several times heretofore, and I think the reasons which have been given for the age limitations of the bill, while not convincing to me, are probably conclusive, since we need but a small proportion of our man power. Certain it is that the limit robs the bill to all claim of establishing universality of service. Nevertheless, it is beyond question a discrimination between men within a certain age limit and men without it, particularly where the same limit is not applied to those who may volunteer under the provisions of the law.

When so many exemptions appear in this measure and opportunity given for many more, when whole classes of the community are included in them, do we not see abundant opportunity for the exercise of political influence in securing the recognition of the claims of those who do not wish to serve? There is not a man within the sound of my voice, there is not a Member of either House who, under the provisions of the bill as it stands, will not be besieged to use his influence, to use every exertion possible, to secure exemption from the operation of the law, and especially in view of the admitted fact that a comparatively small percentage of those included will be needed. The result will be that those who would volunteer will be drafted and those who would not volunteer will stay at home.

So I think, Mr. President, the bill, irrespective of the fundamental objections to it, should be amended so as to make it in some measure what it purports to be—a system of universal selective service, combined with authority to the President to assign those exempted to other fields of effort and to conscript them for those purposes when qualified to serve therein.

Now, Mr. President, let me say a word about existing laws upon the subject under consideration, and I am through. I do not think the volunteer system has been given a fair or any serious trial since the beginning of this war. In 1914 at the request of the administration we passed the volunteer law. I have it here. It was approved on the 25th day of April, 1914, and was enacted at the request and with the approval of the General Staff. It provides for the raising of volunteer forces and their organization and maintenance during the existence of war or when war is imminent, and only after the Congress shall have authorized the President to raise such a force.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to call the Senator's attention to this fact. When the national defense act was before Congress the Senator will remember what a desperate fight the friends of that very act made on the floor of the Senate to have section 56 retained in the bill. Now, the object of section 56 was to make applicable in time of peace the volunteer act of 1914, and the Senate voted it down.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator will remember, if I may interrupt him, that in that controversy he and I were in perfect accord—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am only calling the Senator's attention to it because he is disposed to criticize this bill now because the volunteer act of 1914 seems to him to have been abandoned when Congress itself turned it down.

Mr. THOMAS. No; the Senator mistakes my purpose. I am not now criticizing either the committee or the pending bill. What I want to suggest is that we have not been asked to legislate so as to make the volunteer bill effective. If that had

been done, the emergency provisions of that measure, many of which are very commendable, would have been put in full force and effect, and we would then have had a test for volunteers which we have not now and have not had under the provisions of the existing law. The present campaign for recruits is not attracting volunteers nor appealing to the volunteer spirit of the country. I think, Mr. President, we should give, as we can give under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], full play to the operation of that spirit which I know exists. Had we done so, the enlistment of volunteers would have reached high tide long ago and demonstrated the futility of this bill. And we should make Army life more attractive. Instead of asking men to serve for nothing, the sentiment behind which I cordially approve, we should do what Canada has done, what Great Britain has done, and increase the pay now received by the American soldier. We should also make more wholesome provision for his vocational education in times of peace. We should diminish the chasm of caste which yawns between the commissioned officer and the man. By such methods we can attract all the volunteers we shall ever need.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator just a moment in this part of his argument?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think one reason for the increase of pay of the enlisted man in Canada and the provisions made for the care of his family was that the volunteer system took men who ought not to have been compelled to go. It took men with families; it took men with dependents; it took men who were very much needed at home. Under that condition of things, which is guarded against in this measure, it was almost essential that the Government should either pay the men more or else make a charitable institution of the whole Government and take care of its people.

Mr. THOMAS. Granting all that, Mr. President, I affirm that the selective principle can be made as applicable to the volunteer system as to any other. Canada has been doing so for some time.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended, largely because of the interruptions, which were very opportune, but which necessarily have protracted the discussion. I have endeavored to give some of the reasons why the amendments proposed by the minority of the committee should be incorporated into this bill, and why the bill in some of its details is radically and fundamentally defective, and why the bill should be postponed to the test of the American volunteer system of Army creation. I have by no means exhausted the subject, but I have done.

I do not flatter myself that I have convinced my associates, but I have discharged a duty to myself at least in spreading my view upon the Record, in reply to the thousands of communications with which I have been flooded from the advocates and the opponents of this measure since it was given a place upon the calendar.

Your bill may secure a majority here. It may become, a statute, and as such the basis of our future military policy. If so, I trust that it may not, as I fear it will, profoundly alter the structure of our Government, substitute enforced service for the time-honored, Anglo-Saxon principle of voluntary duty; subject the citizenry of a Republic to the domination of the War Department, displace our Regular Army, and plant the seeds of militarism in the soil of our institutions. For this the military hierarchy have long striven; for this those who do not trust the people have long been striving. The Nation's supreme crisis is their opportunity, and well are they taking advantage of it.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I have received so many communications from different parts of the country, and especially from the good people of the State which I have the honor in part to represent, opposing or approving the present stand of the administration in the international crisis that I desire very briefly to put into the Record a few of the reasons which impel me to support the administration, and do it heartily so long as it takes no backward step.

I do not believe there is a Member of this body whose dread of war is more profound than mine, and it is precisely because I want peace above everything else in the world that I shall vote for universal military training and service.

I can see no peace for us or anyone else until the present war is ended in the way we would have it end, and if I am right about this, it is high time that we assisted those who are fighting our battles.

Our forefathers brought with them to this country the gospel of democracy, but they brought it in their powder horns, and it is my belief that no purer, holier stuff was ever made than the powder which those old Concord farmers used at Lexington. It is up to us to emulate their example whenever it is necessary.

From the very beginning the issue of peace or war has been above and beyond the control of the President. He is not to be blamed for the conditions which exist to-day, or praised for the conditions which existed on the 7th of November last. As long as the central powers believed they could accomplish their purposes by victories on the land, they found it expedient and easy to keep us out of the war; but when they realized that their only chance of ultimate victory lay in the starvation of one or more of their enemies, they immediately put us into the war, and to-day our case is precisely that of Belgium.

In August, 1914, the central powers notified Belgium that if she would surrender her neutral rights on the land she would be unharmed.

A few weeks ago we received notice from the central powers that if we would surrender our neutral rights on the sea we would be unharmed.

Our case is that of Belgium, and our cause is the same. It is a cause as old as justice—a cause for which every liberty-loving Teuton as well as Saxon has fought for more than 15 centuries—and the fact now is that the atrocious methods adopted by the armies of the central powers have brought down upon the heads of those responsible the righteous indignation of the whole world.

In my opinion our position as a Nation is unassailable. The heart and conscience of the great mass and body of the German people bitterly opposed the leadership that started the war. Anyone who will look at the RECORD of the last week of July, 1914, will find abundant corroboration of this statement. I have here some editorial comments from the great liberal German paper, the *Vorwärts*, representing probably 60 per cent or more of the real will of the German people. That journal took a very definite stand, and I desire to call now the attention of the Senate to two or three expressions found in its editorials on July 25, 1914, the week preceding the declaration of war.

War fury unrestrained by Austrian imperialism is setting out to bring death and destruction to the whole of Europe.

Four days later, on July 29, it denounced the German foreign office for not accepting England's mediation proposal in the following language:

The camarilla of war lords is working with absolutely unscrupulous means to carry out their fearful designs to perpetrate an international war and to start a world-wide fire to devastate Europe.

On July 31, when it was evident that nothing could stay the guilty Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs in their lust for war, the *Vorwärts* declared that the German Government was "utterly without conscience." Moreover, mass meetings were held in the great cities throughout the Empire, protesting the insane and brutal course of the Government. In Berlin alone, on the 29th of July, 28 mass meetings were held. At one of them there were more than 70,000 men in attendance. These were spontaneous meetings, called for the purpose of registering the protest of the German people against the "crime that the German rulers were about to commit."

Only a few years ago the master of Germany declared our Monroe doctrine to be a piece of "incredible impertinence." More recently Herr Barnhardi and Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg stated the Imperial German world policy in the following language: "Necessity knows no law. The injustices we thus commit—in Belgium—we will repair as soon as our military object has been obtained," and that object is to "expand our frontiers for the accommodation of our surplus population."

In carrying out this plan the central powers have filled the world with spies and lies. They have maimed, murdered, robbed, raped, burned, and buried Christian men and women for the express purpose of stealing their land. This is the "kultur" of the German war lords and the creed of his satanic majesty.

The central powers overlook the fact that the natural law of evolution which, in the absence of reason, decrees the survival of the brutally fit, deals with one individual at a time and with individuals only. Cooperation and respect for the rights of others make nations possible, and the time has come when international cooperation is as necessary for the peace and prosperity of the world as national cooperation has been necessary for the peace and prosperity of a nation. The marvelous economic advances of the last century have obliterated national boundaries except for political purposes. Commercial evolution is already international; moral and intellectual evolution and growth are international.

More than a century ago that great German, Emmanuel Kant, said that the world would never have peace until the nations of the world could politically organize to enforce peace. But in these days, when international cooperation in politics is suggested, we are told by our statesmen that it would mean en-

tangling alliances, and the historic advice of Washington in this regard is quoted as concluding the argument. We hear, too, the thoughtless exclamations, "Human nature is always the same; men always have fought and they always will," and so forth.

I have great respect for the advice given us by the Father of his Country, but Washington did not hesitate to enter into an alliance with France, and this great man once said, "Mankind when left to themselves are unfit for government." We must have more courage than this to-day. The instant we admit that the international mind should be a reasonable mind all our fears vanish. There are as many kinds of human nature as there are human beings, and all of them are constantly changing, and most of them are changing for the better. It is true that they all swing on the pivot of selfishness, and probably always will, and for this very reason international peace is possible. If everybody is on the make and aggressive, war does not pay anybody; cooperation in the interests of peace is the only thing possible with reasonable beings.

It is our business now to help stem the tide of barbarism until sanity is restored to central Europe.

But patriotic declamations and declarations will not do this. Appropriations of money do not win battles. Fortunately for us, the British fleet up to date has kept the devastating hordes of central Europe from our shores, but it will be criminal neglect for us to ignore the possibility of attack. The sea, instead of protecting us against the enemy, as has heretofore been the case, may now be used to hide and conceal hostile ships and permit them to select their point of attack without let or hindrance.

We do not want to back into this war with the idea that we can get out more easily. We must make common cause with those who are fighting our enemies. We must expect to see it through, and we must expect our allies to stand by until the end. We must give and receive assurances that will permit no misunderstanding in this regard. But to do this we may need soldiers as well as talkers, and soldiers enough to insure victory now and freedom from attack in the future.

Soldiering is a hazardous occupation at the best, and soldiers untrained and unequipped are worse than useless. If we must fight, we must win, and we can not expect to do this if we send our young men into the field unfitted for the work to be done. It seems to me very clear that the more men we train the surer will be the ultimate victory and the longer the succeeding peace. I can see no danger in strength in a just cause. Weakness is always powerless for good.

Now, it is clear to me that universal military training is the first step necessary if reason is to win the victory over cruelty and greed. When the right ceases to resist it ceases to exist. We do not fear the skilled surgeon, though he deals with deadly weapons. We welcome him into our community, because he is a protection against death and disease. Why should we fear military skill if we are sure of its purpose? We should let it be known that our goal is international peace based upon justice to all men. No more wars of conquest, but constant wars against it, if need be.

It is not many years since England was the ally of Turkey and her purpose was to prevent Russian aggression. Twenty years ago our statesmen were warning us against the Russian advance—the Slavic peril. Ten years ago it was the yellow peril, inspired by Germany. Russia and China are now democracies, the last thing on earth that our statesmen expected and the best possible thing for the peace of the world. Within a fortnight after Russia rid herself of ridiculous and dangerous czarism she told the nations of the earth that she stood squarely against aggression. She did not want Constantinople. She wanted peace and justice to all men, and she would fight for that to the last man, and nothing else.

The unselfish course we have taken in world politics has compelled the admiration of other nations, and if we remain loyal to that course the other nations must follow our example. Our remission of the Chinese indemnity, our freedom of Cuba and the Philippines, a work of pure philanthropy unequalled in the history of the world, Mr. Blaine's efforts in 1890 to secure the consent of the Latin-American countries to eliminate the right to title by conquest from the international laws of the Western Hemisphere, and our consistent forbearance with weak and semicivilized States, are things to be proud of. If, however, the square deal for nations as well as men is to be our watchword, there must be no doubt of our strength to resist aggression and injustice, and now is the time for us to reaffirm our international policy and put ourselves in a position to maintain it. Now is our opportunity to secure the cooperation of the world in the maintenance of our Monroe doctrine and encourage the extension of its vital principle throughout the

world. We may well hope, and, I think, expect that England and France and Russia and Italy and Japan and the Americas will henceforth stand together for peace and intellectual, moral, and economic cooperation in so far as varying conditions will permit.

And we may legitimately expect great benefits at home in the immediate by-products of universal military training. Among these benefits will be better health for the rising generations. Fifty per cent or more of the present one is physically defective. We may expect greater respect for law and order and a keener sense of duty to neighbor and country. The intermingling of rich and poor in impartial and mutual service will result in a clearer conception of the duty which the fortunate owe to the less fortunate.

There is nothing too high or noble for us to attempt, and nothing we may fail to accomplish if we are in a position—if we are strong enough—to support our ideals as the occasion may require.

If the training is universal then the service must be universal. Universal training with voluntary service only would be absurd.

I realize that universal training and service is somewhat in the future. We can not expect to put this law for universal training and service into practical application so that it will produce armies containing any great number of men within the year or possibly within the two years, and it is quite likely that for our immediate needs some modification of the system should permit volunteers to a certain extent; and while I am in favor of selective conscription, I should hope that the system adopted by Congress would permit at least 100,000 men, if we have them and they are needed, to organize as volunteers.

I will call the attention of the Senate to an incident which has come to my knowledge recently in support of the position of those who would permit at this time the organization of a certain number of volunteers. A boy brought up within a stone's throw of where I live read about the war, took a great interest in it, and became convinced more than two years ago that France was fighting our battle and that it was his duty to enlist. So he went to France with a brother—two of them. You may have noticed in the metropolitan press two weeks ago that Douglas Dodge, of Westogue, Conn., was awarded the war cross for special bravery in service. This boy inherited from his father a large fortune. His father is now dead. His mother is the president of the American Antisuffrage Society. But this is only one instance of many that could be noted of American boys going to the front. You may have noticed that a boy from Texas led the assault at Vimy with the American flag tied to his bayonet.

If it is necessary for us to send immediately some men to the front, I hope that we shall send a sample that those who follow must emulate and who will demonstrate to the world the danger of defying the United States; and I sincerely hope that the committee will agree to some amendment that will provide for what may be the immediate necessities of the situation, will permit volunteer service to a limited degree, because there is something about those boys—the one I have mentioned and the twenty or thirty thousand that may be there—that lifts them above any other service which you may expect to get. They have the right stuff in them, and plenty of it, and we are proud of them.

But if the war continues we must resort to universal training and service, and I have become firmly convinced that the Nation has everything to gain—physically, morally, and economically—by remaining loyal to the spirit of the fathers in deed as well as speech.

But in our haste to indulge in universal military training let it be clearly understood that the needs of the hour are transportation and food. The administration will be blind, indeed, if it does not see that just now we should concentrate all our energies upon escaping or sinking submarines and raising crops. The future peace of the world and the fate of democracy may depend upon the use we make of the present planting season. Every State and every county and town should organize a planting campaign and march to the front in double-quick time, and every man in every community should do his bit with money or muscle to help feed the heroes who are fighting our battles in the trenches of France. A famine in England next winter means surrender, and surrender means death and despair for tens of millions of brave men and women, and it may mean 20 years of war for the United States. If the central powers should win a temporary victory; if we should allow France and Belgium and England to bear this cross alone, and they should fail, there are few men in this country who will dare say that it would not mean from 10 to 20 years of war in the near future.

If the American women want to win the gratitude and admiration of the world and save their boys from the horrors of war, let them make the vegetable garden the fashionable salon for the season of 1917. The handsomest, bravest, sweetest women in the world to-day are the English and French girls in trousers and caps making munitions for their husbands and brothers and sweethearts at the front.

For more than two years we looked for our duty in a thrifty, indifferent neutrality, and we failed to find it there. For more than two years we tried to convince ourselves that cowardice is a virtue, and we failed again for obvious reasons. We see our duty now. We must train our boys to defend their country, and we must feed and equip the boys that are already at the front, if we would avoid bitter tears of regret and long years of conflict.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I propose an amendment, which I ask to have printed and to lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, whatever opinion may be held by the people as to the cause of the European war and as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the conduct of this administration in connection with the European belligerents during the two years and eight months prior to the recognition by Congress of a state of war between the United States and Germany, there can now be no difference of opinion between patriotic Americans on the question of the duty of the United States to anticipate by the most immediate intelligent action every reasonably possible emergency which it may meet in that war. What has been written has been written and it is now the highest duty of loyalty to democracy, unprejudiced by the past, uncontrolled by partisanship and uninfluenced by passion or weakly sentiment to understand the present and prepare to meet what may prove to be the supreme test of the Republic. That our Government and its institutions are threatened, no thoughtful, intelligent man will deny. That the United States must win in this most vital crisis of history is as important as is the survival of democracy and its concomitants.

Nearly 150 years ago the fathers lighted on these shores the fires of democracy, and they have been kept burning with increasing brightness until this hour. Their effulgent beams have been the beacon which has joyfully attracted the seeker for liberty and the lover of freedom from every section of the globe. By this light other nations have read their duty to mankind and freedom has been extended to other lands. But not all who have watched our fires have been grateful for their blessed light and warmth. Self-styled divine monarchs have realized that democracy was the mortal enemy of monarchy, and the effulgence of the former has filled them with a hatred uncompromising and a dread indefinable. By our beacon light our enemies have studied our weaknesses and have profited by them, so that while our Republic has demonstrated its true greatness it has at the same time disclosed its defects. Not the least of these defects has been the fact that in the midst of ravenous wolves we have left our human flock unprotected. We now know that we must strengthen our fold pending the time we are destroying these enemies of peace and progress. Our past neglect of preparation has rendered our present duty difficult and expensive. Further delay and procrastination now is certain to mean disaster if not destruction later. It is unfortunate that we failed in time of peace to prepare for the complete and unquestioned protection of our country. At such a time the preparation would have been less expensive; it would have been more intelligently effective; it would have avoided the grave and dangerous problems which now confront us; but again I am reminded that the past is gone. From the extravagant school of experience, however, we may acquire some wisdom. Our duty is here and now, and it is not too late to overcome some of the effects of error.

I am inexpressibly depressed when I think of the distressing possibilities which may come—aye, some of them must come even under the most favorable conditions—as a result of the war in which we are now engaged. The tax burdens which will test our industries; the want, privations, and sufferings. But I am somewhat revived by the thought that out of it will come a national and individual economy essential to the true progress of a nation and its people, which has been retarded to a great extent by that soul-destroying spirit of extravagance born of a desire for wealth, ease, luxury, and irresponsibility. I can see a new birth of patriotism essential to the life of the Republic. I can see democracies erected on the ruins of monarchies. I can see a world regenerated somewhat by the baptism of blood. But whatever shall be the cost of this war in terms of suffering, blood, and treasure, there is but one course for the United States Government to take at this time, and that is to mobilize

its every resource to meet any emergency. The very present duty before Congress is to raise and equip an army. Without a dissenting vote in either House the largest appropriation for military and naval preparation ever known in the history of any nation has been provided, and we are now properly debating the question of how to raise the strongest and most efficient army possible.

I confess my deficient knowledge of the technical and yet controlling questions of army organization. I am unfamiliar even with the rank and duties of officers. My efforts and experience have been confined to the work of peace. I had almost believed that it was impossible for our great peace-loving country to engage in a European war. I am now, however, awake to the fact that I am a Member of that branch of the Government which is charged with the awful duty of preparing for entrance into the greatest war the world has ever known. At such a time and under such conditions I am inclined to give more weight to the opinions of men trained and experienced in matters of warfare. For 14 years I voted the people's money for support of the West Point and Annapolis Academies. I did it with the undoubting belief that war and war preparation was at once a science and an art to be mastered as other technical matters are mastered. In constructing a skyscraper, a suspension bridge, or a railroad we follow the advice of skilled architects and engineers rather than the advice of laymen, however honest or friendly. Only the learned and experienced scholar can write an authoritative textbook on mathematics. Only the trained and highly educated surgeon is trusted to perform major operations. In fact, our civilization is largely based upon the advice and leadership of experts who have specialized and whose knowledge and experience entitle them to advise and lead.

I know of no place in our social, political, or national economy where this rule is more applicable than in war. All the others deal either with material things or with isolated individuals. But war involves the resources and lives of a whole people. Nations are the objects of its operations. The present war is the most gigantic of history. Its methods are largely new. Only military and naval genius comprehends it, and so when nations centuries old are being toppled over as houses of cards, when free institutions are threatened with destruction, when mistakes of patriotic ignorance means additional death and disaster, I must look for knowledge to guide me in this fateful hour to the men our country has trained to advise and lead at such a time. I know that experts do not always agree and that theory sometimes is impeached by experience, but when theory and practice without an authoritative exception agree my duty becomes clear. Fortunately at this time those men who have been educated by the Government at West Point and Annapolis agree with the similarly unanimous opinion of those experienced soldiers who were not educated at our academies but in the camp and on the battle field. When all these square their theories with the experience of all nations, and especially with that of the nations of Europe, who have been warring for the last two years and eight months, I am bound by every dictate of duty to my country to ignore the advice of laymen when opposed to that of those who know.

I am not going to delay the Senate by recounting the history of our country's experience with volunteers. All of our wars have been fought at their beginning by volunteers, but at what a cost of life and treasure. Due to the mistaken policy which our Government has always followed, it has been necessary to enter all wars with untrained, poorly equipped soldiers, and so far as efficiency is concerned it has made, and will now make, little difference whether the voluntary or draft system was or shall be employed, except perhaps that with the same previous preparation the enlisted man is generally a better soldier than the conscript for the reason that he is more patriotic. But no great war ever was fought or ever will be fought largely by volunteers. Conscription must come, as it always has come, and in the end both patriotism and efficiency, aye, democracy itself, demand that equality of governmental benefits shall require equality of service and responsibility.

I have but little more patience with the man who is now talking of immediately sending an American army to Europe when we have no army to send and can have none fit to send within a year than I have for him who would, in terms, limit military service to the United States. Whatever army is raised must be mustered for service during the war and for whatever field the emergencies of war may select. Our present duty is to raise and equip an army as quickly and equitably as possible. Personally I believe that army will not be called to foreign shores, but at any rate its soldiers will have from 8 to 12 months' training before such an event can happen. How shall such an army be raised? It appears that nearly everybody believes in universal military and industrial training, but such training does not at present exist, and hence that principle can not aid our country now in

creating an army; that is, such training can not be employed technically to fit our soldiers. If, however, it is established, it will be an inspiration to patriotism by inducing men to think of duty as well as privilege. I shall not occupy time now to discuss universal training. That it is right every patriotic, right-thinking man seems to admit; but the fact is an army must be provided now, and it will be composed at the start of untrained men. God grant that my opinion that it will never be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, and certainly that it will not be within the year, shall be verified.

I am in accord with the men whose opinions are entitled to highest consideration that selective conscription is the fairest and most democratic method to employ. It is in harmony with universal training in this, viz, it recognizes the duty of universal service.

I am not, however, in accord with that provision of the bill which fixes the minimum and maximum ages of the conscript. I would like to have a census of all men in the United States between the ages of 16 and 70. I would then classify all of them as to special fitness for service to the United States. I know, as every thoughtful man knows, that our success in this war will depend not more upon our Army and Navy than upon our ability to feed and clothe, equip and maintain, our people and that Army and Navy. Not only that but the necessities of those countries which are fighting with us against a common foe are depending upon us for food and other supplies. A duty thus devolves upon our every citizen to serve in the manner for which he is best fitted. It would be an expensive if not a fatal mistake to permit men and boys to leave those necessary employments for which they are fitted without at least putting in their places others equally efficient. After making such a selection, I would list all those remaining men between the ages of 21 and 45 who are physically fit and from that list, equitably apportioned among the States, I would draw by lot the number of men required for an army. The rich and the poor, the patriot and the shirker, all would be placed on an equal footing as to liability for service.

The patriot with red blood in his veins shrinks at the word "conscript," because he feels that it would disgrace him to be compelled to serve while his comrade volunteers. If all were drafted, this humiliation would not exist.

There are millions of fathers and mothers in this country who raised their sons to be soldiers if soldiers were necessary to the honor and preservation of their country, but they feel that other boys like theirs should be subject to the same duties and obligations. They are willing and anxious that their loved ones should bear their share and only their share of the national defense. It is improbable that all of the men of military age and fitness will be taken into the Army. Not 1 in 12 can serve, but every one of the 12 should be subject to conscription. If, however, the volunteer service is employed, only the conscientious and patriotic will enlist, and they are of the very best of our people.

I see no valid reason why physically fit men up to 45 should not be liable to army service. They have had 26 years more of the benefits of government than has the boy of 19. Many of these men want to serve. Many of them have had valuable experience in the Spanish War and in the militia. They would enlarge the field of eligibles and lessen the chance of each individual citizen to draft. You ask the boy to fight for the uncertain future. You deny the man an opportunity to repay the certain advantages which he has already enjoyed.

It is barely possible that our boys under age may be called to the colors later, but at present it is not necessary and they should be allowed to finish their education, their apprenticeship in trade, their preparation for life. I have received many letters from fathers asking that they be permitted to serve in place of their boys. No worthy reason has been presented to me why this should not be done. I expect to offer an amendment to this end if no one else does.

Mr. BRADY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. BRADY. I wish to offer a suggestion at this time relative to the very splendid argument the Senator is making. I should like to have the Senator give an expression as to his viewpoint relative to exemptions from service as well as the limit of years. The pending bill provides, as the Senator is well aware, for those from 19 to 25. An amendment has been offered including those from 18 to 35. The Senator suggests that he will probably offer an amendment embracing those from 21 to 45. I should like to have the Senator express himself as to what he thinks the exemption should be from that selective conscription service.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have already stated that first I would classify all of our people. A man who is well at 70 years of age can render distinctive service to the country. I know there are many men in this country who are prepared to do certain work for the Government on the farms or in various industries who would not be fit for field service. I have purposely increased the age to 70 for industrial or domestic service, but have confined my military list to the ages between 21 and 45. From that, if I had my way about it, I would exempt all the men between those ages who are now engaged in employment necessary for the maintenance of an army and for the maintenance of the industries of the Republic. I would keep them employed at home. I would keep certain people on the farm. I would keep people in munition factories. I would keep certain other employments busy or well filled because that is a part of the need for our success.

Mr. BRADY. I realize that, and I desire to have the Senator cover that point fully. At this time I desire to ask him whether he would have the men who are not physically fit for military service drafted for the other lines of service he suggests?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would. I would certainly not draft for military service a man who is not fit physically to serve.

Mr. BRADY. Who is not capable of rendering military service. The Senator thinks that is the object to be attained?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Quite so.

Mr. President, I realize the prejudice which attaches to the word "conscription." I would divest it of that odium by making it universal in its application. I would give every man of military age and fitness the same chance. I would not penalize patriotism for the benefit of shirkers and cowards. I would endeavor to instill in all the paramount idea of service for benefits. Only as a last resort would I call to the Army and Navy for continuous field service the boys upon whose life preparation the future progress of our Republic depends.

Whatever method for obtaining an army is employed, the Government must provide for the dependents of its soldiers, and the man in the ranks must receive greater pay than is at present provided. Those who do not enter the country's armed service must in good conscience care for those and their families who do enter it. Especially must this be done if the voluntary method is employed. I have no doubt that such a provision would stimulate enlistments. The crucial test of deciding between country and the necessities of dependent loved ones should not be applied to our men by a rich and prosperous people. The possibility of dependency should be avoided, and I believe it can be avoided.

Perhaps I have already occupied more time than I ought to have occupied. I realize that time is of the very essence of our success, but I also know that such success depends largely upon the kind of action we take now. Haste may mean irreparable waste, and Congress should not enact legislation without at least first reading the bills proposing it.

I realize that it would be more popular to advocate voluntary service, but, sir, he is an enemy of his country who courts popularity at such a time as this. Can Senators, most of whom will under any circumstance be exempt from field service, think of their political futures while providing for a war in which their constituents' lives and fortunes will be sacrificed? Mr. President, I believe I speak the true sentiments of a great majority of Senators when I say I would gladly sink into political oblivion—aye, I would unhesitatingly yield up my life—if by doing so I could alleviate the heartaches, avert the loss of life, and more speedily accomplish the success of our arms and the permanent triumph of democracy. Such a sacrifice would, of course, be insignificant. What may happen to me is unimportant; but what may happen to my country and my countrymen is all-important, and to it and them I pledge my unselfish devotion. I believe in universal military training. It can not, however, be of any service to us in this present duty, but should be inaugurated for the immediate future. I believe in universal service. Conscription approximates such service and places our citizens of all nationalities, of all stations in life, upon an equal footing. That is democracy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, having had the honor of serving upon the committee which has had the pending measure under consideration, and having voted to report it to the Senate with a favorable recommendation, I consider it a duty to my conscience and to my country to present my reasons for such action on my part.

Moreover, having served as a volunteer myself, and having seen what I believe to be the imperfections of the system, I feel that I am in a position to comment, and that I should comment, upon the merits of the bill now before the Senate.

I have an honest conviction that the administration should be sustained in its effort to create an army of 500,000 men, in

addition to the Regular Army and National Guard—now lacking about 500,000 recruits—an army where the burden of service will fall alike on all and give the Government, under its central authority, an efficient, controllable, mobile force of fighting men.

Having a proper regard and respect for the opinions of other Senators who oppose this measure, I desire to state why I believe the universal compulsory system is better, in the light of past and recent history, than the volunteer system.

As a preliminary to my remarks upon the bill itself, I desire to say with all the emphasis that I can command that I do not for a moment question the sublime valor of hundreds of thousands of patriotic Americans who in the several crises of the Nation's history have voluntarily rallied to the colors and fought and died in defense of liberty and justice. Their heroic deeds make resplendent the annals of the Republic.

Nor, in my position in this matter, have I anything but praise for the members of the National Guard, with which I was identified eight years. They, too, when the call to duty has sounded, have responded splendidly and rendered the best service of which they were capable.

For over a century Americans have been unwilling to accept the most fundamental of truths, namely, that self-preservation, with nation and individual alike, is the first law of nature. To bring about an awakening, it has been necessary for fate to turn two-thirds of the world into a maelstrom, and finally to bring this country to its very brink.

We have passed through five wars without being willing to recognize the fact that our military system was always a lamentable failure; that most of these wars were frightfully costly in blood and treasure, solely because of unpreparedness, and that, without exception, each one should have been brought to a close much sooner than it was.

Now, however, fronting the most crucial experience in our history, we are made to realize that our existing and former systems were fundamentally defective, and that to save ourselves from annihilation as a Nation, we must make a radical departure and adjust ourselves to the imperative demands of this impending crisis.

No one at all familiar with real American history can fail to recognize the fact that the conduct of the Revolutionary War by the Continental Government was wretchedly faulty, in that Congress could not give, or did not give, Washington an adequate army of properly trained soldiers to oppose the regulars sent over by the British Crown. The irregular volunteer forces placed at his disposal were almost useless, and rendered abortive all the plans of the commander in chief.

Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress, September 24, 1776, said:

To place any dependence upon militia is assuredly resting upon a broken staff.

He also said:

To expect, then, the same service from raw and undisciplined recruits as from veteran soldiers is to expect what never did and perhaps never will happen.

Writing October 22, 1780, Washington exclaimed, in an agony of despondency almost reaching despair:

If we mean to continue our struggle, we must do it upon an entirely new plan. We must have a permanent force, not a force that is constantly fluctuating and sliding from under us, as a pedestal of ice would do from a statue on a summer's day, involving us in expense that baffles calculation—an expense which no funds are equal to.

It is idle to suppose that raw and undisciplined men are fit to oppose regular troops.

Writing March 1, 1781, to Richard Henry Lee, speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, Thomas Jefferson, then governor of that State, said:

Whether it be practicable to raise and maintain a sufficient number of Regulars to carry on the war is a question. That it would be burdensome is undoubted, yet it is perhaps as certain that no possible mode of carrying it on can be so expensive to the public, so distressing and disgusting to individuals, as the militia.

"Light Horse Harry" Lee wrote:

A government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uninformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle.

It is not necessary to dwell further upon the evils of the volunteer system during the Revolution, which prolonged for eight years a war which should have been determined in eight months.

The War of 1812 was so attended by blunders and humiliations that a review of its history can not fail to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of the patriotic American.

In October, 1812, a body of troops, less than 1,000 in number, crossed the St. Lawrence River to attack a British force. An engagement took place, which would have resulted in a victory for the Americans had the militia on the New York side of the

river crossed to their aid. What was the result? Let McMaster, the historian, tell the story:

No sooner did the militia behold a real battle, no sooner did they see the dead brought back in the boats and hear the groans of the wounded, than fear overcame them and they refused to cross. Soldiers who the day before were clamorous to be brought face to face with what they called the British hirelings now stood on their constitutional rights and refused to help their countrymen. They were, they said, militia, and the only services for which the militia could be called out were to uphold the laws, to put down insurrection, to repel invasion. The Constitution did not give the President power to send them out of the United States, and they would not go.

Holding such views, they stood quietly on the American side, saw the British gather in force and march up the hill, saw their countrymen, overwhelmed by numbers, driven back foot by foot to the edge of the cliff and down the side of the river bank, where, as no one would row a boat across, the little band of 600 threw down their arms and surrendered. With them were captured some 300 skulkers and cowards, who had been crouching at the river edge all day.

Concerning the lamentable happenings in and about Washington in 1813 we need say little. It is a black page in American history. The Volunteer Army defending the city was routed with a loss of only 8 killed and 11 wounded. The Capitol was destroyed and the White House was sacked. The invading forces, it is said, comprised only 1,500 British troops.

So much for the "efficiency" of the volunteer system in the War of 1812!

Concerning the War with Mexico, let us quote from a modern writer, who, after commenting upon some early successes of our arms, says:

About one month later at Pueblo, his [Gen. Scott's] progress came to a sudden halt because the terms of enlistment of 7 out of his 11 best regiments were on the eve of expiring, and Scott discovered that most of the men intended to exercise the alternative offered to them upon enlistment, and to terminate their services at the end of 12 months. In the midst of a hostile country and only three days march from the capital, with virtually no enemy to oppose him, Scott was unable to budge for more than three months until he had been joined by reinforcements—all of them raw by comparison with the troops which had left him. For three months his situation was very precarious, and it was only good luck that averted a calamity. When he did fight his way into Mexico, in August, 1847, it was at a loss for which there was no justification.

Certain proponents of the volunteer system have said, and still others will say, that the Mexican War was mainly won by volunteers. This is quite true. Yet the system failed in the crisis I have indicated.

During the Civil War the inadequacy of the volunteer system was exhibited in a startling manner, especially during the early stages of the struggle. The first Battle of Bull Run demonstrated the futility of compelling raw recruits to undergo a baptism of blood. As one writer, a Northern man, says:

As a result of this battle the South was demoralized by victory and the North by defeat, and nothing further of importance occurred that year, notwithstanding that there were 437,105 more Federal troops under arms than Confederates.

A former Secretary of War, Luke E. Wright, in an address some time ago, said:

The fact is that the Confederacy in our Civil War thought that they would lick the Yankees in just a year. They gave themselves ample margin, and so they enlisted their men for 12 months. The 12 months expired and they were mistaken, woefully so; and thereupon by a conscription act all of those 12 months' men were simply blanketed into the army for the rest of war.

The Federals only gave themselves 90 days to finish the Rebellion, and they went upon the idea of voluntary service; but at the end of 12 months they seemed to be no nearer than they were at the beginning. They had to reorganize their whole system. Then they began a system of bounties, and finally went to the system of drafting or conscription.

The occurrences of our last war, that with Spain, are familiar to all present-day Americans.

The muddling which characterized the recruiting of the volunteer army hurriedly mobilized in the spring of 1898 is ineffaceably stamped upon the memories of us all. Such a breakdown in every direction, including the Quartermaster's, the Commissary, the Ordnance, and the Medical Departments, was never before known in the annals of warfare.

The men who volunteered were brave men, patriotic men, enthusiastic men, full of the spirit of service and devoted to the sublimest ideals of citizenship.

But they were not soldiers. Many of them were office clerks, salesmen, factory operatives, raw, green, soft, thoroughly undisciplined, absolutely lacking in all the essentials of army training, ignorant of the simplest principles of hygiene and sanitation, hurriedly rushed to the front, poorly equipped and trained. And what was the result?

Is it necessary to ask? Is there any American who has not heard of the horrors of Montauk Point, of Chattanooga, of Tampa, and of the other great camps, where scores of fine young Americans, filled with an enthusiasm that was glorious, were stricken down with typhoid and other dread scourges, martyrs to a system of inefficiency?

I had some experience in the Spanish-American War with the volunteer system. I observed also the result obtained from our

small Army of Regular troops, so striking in contrast both as to self-care and efficiency. I saw men of the Volunteers die by the score—brave men, useful men—whose lives could have been saved had they been safeguarded by a proper system of preparedness. I saw the best men volunteer. I saw and knew of these men broken in health because they were sent away too soon and did not receive proper food or proper care.

I saw political pull exercised to secure positions for men physically unfit and mentally unprepared to be sent to the front. I saw them receive the pay of colonels and majors—yes; of generals—while men of the Regular Army, soldiers bearing the scars of Indian battles in the conquering of the West, humbly submitted to orders and failed to rise above a captain's pay, although they had waited a lifetime for well-earned promotion.

And who was responsible for the entire failure of every phase of the mobilization program of 1898? Who was responsible for the chaos which prevailed? Who was responsible for not the comedy but the tragedy of errors which marked and marred every stage of the conduct of the war?

I remember quite distinctly that Senators upon this floor, and many gentlemen of the other House, were vigorous in their denunciations of the then Secretary of War, Gen. Alger, because, forsooth, he was not a miracle worker and failed to achieve the impossible.

Did the consciences of those men smite them, that they sought to place unmerited blame on the shoulders of the War Department's head? Did they not, down deep in their hearts, recognize what every student and writer of American history knew only too well, that it was Congress and Congress alone which, because of neglect and indifference, had permitted the country to be hurled suddenly into war, without adequate equipment for such an awful contingency?

What a catalogue of inefficiency and disaster, covering the entire period of the Nation's war history, from 1775 to 1898.

It is idle to do more than mention incidentally Great Britain's distressing experience during the early stages of the present war. Let me quote briefly from a gallant young American, Eric Fisher Wood, who, according to a recent news item, now lies in an English hospital suffering from wounds received in the recent great struggle about Arras. Addressing a Washington audience a year ago, Mr. Wood said:

Military experts agree that at the commencement of the present war the British territorial battalions were superior to our own militia regiments. They had certainly received the equivalent of more than four months' training. And yet, in spite of the desperate need of reinforcements in Flanders, no territorial battalion could be fitted to withstand the test of fire until it had received eight months' additional training. The first territorial battalion to see service did not do so until it had spent eight months in a training camp.

Mr. Wood wisely added:

Troops which have received less than one year's training are worse than useless. Their addition to a weak army only tends to make that army weaker. I repeat that it is axiomatic that troops can not be made fit for battle unless they receive more than one year of training.

The volunteer system was given a splendid test in Great Britain. After an extraordinary campaign, unparalleled in the history of the world, a considerable army was raised, but eventually a resort to conscription was found to be imperative in order to mobilize the supreme strength of the Empire against the despotic Governments of central Europe.

A remarkably illuminative picture, exhibiting the respective merits of the two military systems—the regular army and the militia—as they existed in Belgium at the beginning of the war, was shown in an address delivered in this city by Capt. Granville Fortesque, of the United States Army, as follows:

I saw the defense of Liege. I saw the ninth regiment of the line and the fourteenth regiment of the line, men who fought like lions against tremendous odds, who stood up to the last minute, giving every ounce of fight that there was in them, because they were trained and disciplined fighters, and I do not hesitate to say that it was the force developed in those trained and disciplined fighters that saved France. You all know the heroic defense of Liege. I do not have to recount the stories of splendid heroism; how they went back only foot after foot when pressed by enormous artillery superiority.

Now I am going to show you another picture. From Brussels I went down through the valley of the Meuse to Namur. The same kind of men—they were Belgians—were entrusted with the defense of Namur. When I went there dozens of officers were sitting out in front of the cafes. On inquiry I found out that these were more or less irregular troops, gardes civiques and others, who had not yet come under the regular service discipline.

What happened? Two hours and a quarter after the first German gun was fired at Namur the city was surrendered. Why was not the defense at Namur as efficient and as effective as the defense of Liege? Simply because there you had militia forces operating and not the trained and disciplined regular forces of the Belgian Army.

What more can a reasonable man, a reasoning man, ask? Emblazoned upon the pages of history, in letters of undying light, so that he who runs may read, are found innumerable evidences of the failure of the volunteer system.

With history presenting so powerful, so unanswerable, an argument in favor of a regular army, supplemented by com-

pulsory training and service, what have we, the opponents of the latter system, to present? They tell us that compulsion in our military system is an innovation. How amazingly inaccurate! In the earliest period of colonial history, in nearly every Province, the trainband system was introduced by legislative enactment. Compulsory training was exacted, and failure to report for duty on training day was punishable by fine. Wherever, as happened in some Colonies, war came, compulsory service followed compulsory training. Such, we know, was the system in Massachusetts and the other New England Colonies from their very foundation. In the first-named Colony it was provided "that every person, with certain specified exceptions, above the age of 16 is required to serve in a military capacity."

So, too, in my own State, New Jersey, in 1668 the general assembly passed an act providing for compulsory military training of all men between the ages of 16 and 60 years, and imposing fines for failure to report on mustering day. Furthermore, in 1675 another act was passed, whose opening clause was as follows:

Forasmuch as it is requisite of necessity amongst all men to be in a posture of defense against enemies or dangers that may accrue, and especially we being invited hereunto by the insolence and outrages of the heathens in our neighboring colonies, not knowing how soon we may be surprised.

There was an illustration of preparedness which I would commend to my fellow countrymen at the present time.

I am happy to state that throughout its entire colonial history there was never a drop of blood shed in actual warfare upon New Jersey soil. Had war come, as in Massachusetts, then compulsory training would have been followed by compulsory service.

In the Province on the opposite side of the Delaware, founded by the great Quaker, Penn., the colonial legislature refused, for over half a century, to pass a military defense law.

As early as 1689, during a war scare, the provincial council, composed almost entirely of pacifists, refused to equip a military force.

There came a time when Pennsylvania was ravaged by the Indians, and men, women and children were scalped, homes were burned, crops were destroyed, and cattle were stolen. The once-peaceful land of Penn was swept by fire and deluged with blood, because no provision had been made for the training of her citizens.

Surely no one familiar with American history, early American history, will suggest that the compulsory element in military service is an innovation. In this connection, however, I am compelled to make a confession. The trainband compulsory service law was rigidly adhered to in the early history in the Colonies, or certain of them. However, human nature in the eighteenth century was very much like that of the twentieth century. There came a time when, menacing war clouds having disappeared from the sky for a time, men grew lax in their conceptions of public duty and public service. Then the compulsory-training act became practically a dead letter.

What was the result? When the War for Independence suddenly burst upon the world in 1775 the Colonies were altogether unprepared, and independence was secured only after a vast sacrifice in blood and treasure.

The criticism most frequently heard from the lips of those opposed to conscription is that the system is undemocratic. As a matter of fact, it is the very essence of democracy, which is defined as "political and social equality in general."

That nation alone enjoys pure democracy where every citizen demands equal rights and equal privileges with every other citizen. On the other hand, that nation alone enjoys pure democracy which requires equal obligations and equal duties from each of its citizens, without regard to race, color, environment, wealth, or social position.

Lincoln declared that no nation could survive which was half slave and half free. If living to-day, with this stupendous crisis facing him, he would be the first to declare that neither this nor any other people could maintain its prestige, honor and solidarity, if one-half were patriots and one-half were evaders.

A strange democracy, indeed, is that which is willing to have its battles fought alone by the enthusiastic, impulsive, red-blooded men of the Nation who volunteer their services, while a vast majority of its citizens, endowed with no such spirit of duty and sacrifice, slink and cower in the rear, far removed from even the smell of burnt powder.

A distinguished Senator said upon this floor a day or two ago, that the words "conscript" and "convict" might have a similarity in this connection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me—I think he is referring to me—I gave what I understood to have been a statement of another, and with the comment that there was in this country, in my opinion, a sort of feeling that justified it. I did not myself draw the comparison.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understood that the Senator from Colorado quoted from another.

I find no such definition given to the word "conscript" in any standard dictionary. The Century defines it, used as an adjective, as "registered; enrolled." Employed as a noun, it simply means "one who is compulsorily enrolled for military or naval service."

There is nothing there to suggest prison stripes or a convict's cell. There is no taint or ignominy in the word "conscript" when properly employed.

If the Senator will cross the seas in imagination—he will thus be safe from German submarines—he will see a wonderfully inspiring sight "somewhere in France"—a magnificent army, whose deeds will uplift and inspire the souls of this and future generations, all of them "conscripts." I doubt if anyone would presume to designate these valiant compatriots of Lafayette as "convicts."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Notwithstanding the fact that the compulsory system has been in vogue, as the Senator from New Jersey very properly says, since the earliest colonial days, the word "conscript" never was used in connection with the military system until 1798, and then it was based upon the plan of army organization which was reported to the French Assembly by Gen. Jourdan, who had had the matter assigned to him to work out a system under which Napoleon operated.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator is, of course, familiar with the term "conscript fathers," a common rendering of the Latin phrase "patres conscripti" used in addressing the Senate of ancient Rome. Senators were of two classes, we are told, patres, "fathers," or patrician nobles, and conscripti, or those "elected" from the equestrian orders. Whether the "conscript" Senate of the Romans was better than the "volunteer" Senate of America is an academic proposition which I will not discuss in this connection. I might add, however, in passing that it does not seem necessary to resort to "compulsory service" in order to find men to sit in this honorable body.

From the opponents of conscription we hear the doleful cry that a resort to it is a step toward "militarism"; some say a step toward "imperialism."

Does not "militarism" come from the top and not from the bottom; from a despot and not from a free people? "Militarism" is the natural correlative of autocracy. Universal service is the essence of democracy and thus the antithesis of militarism, which by reason of universal readiness will be made impossible in our own land and wiped out of existence as a dominating influence in the world at large.

One of the finest expressions of opinion concerning universal service is that from the pen of Dr. David Jayne Hill, former ambassador to Germany, who says:

No true American desires "militarism" in the United States, and it is to be hoped that we shall never become its victim. It is not in the character and temper of our people to permit it either from without or from within.

But it is in no respect a drift toward "militarism" to say that every able-bodied young man in our country should first be well instructed in the meaning and value of our free institutions and taught a wholesome respect for civil authority, and then be impressed with the privilege and obligation of a full preparation of mind and body to defend them.

A resolute determination to do this would not only cause any power to reflect long before it would disregard the rights of American citizens, but it would elevate and ennoble the tone of the present and the coming generations of American youth. Wholly apart from any danger on land or sea we need the ethical influence of an enlightened patriotism.

Once properly apprehended, the inspiration of national security and American defense would act like a tonic upon our whole people. For years we have been preaching the necessity of performing the dull duties of voting and paying taxes, with the result that we have found little exhilaration in either of them. But why not make every young man feel that he is, in truth, a part of the country and leave with him the sweet memory that he has really served it by fitting himself to be its defender?

Other opponents of conscription say it is unpopular. In granting that I beg to add that war, also, is unpopular but imperative when a nation is compelled to choose between that and German domination.

Never was warfare so unpopular as now—especially the intensified brand of warfare introduced by the archmaniac of Europe which disregards not only international law but all the fundamental laws of humanity as well.

We are not considering questions of popularity but the fundamental questions of national life and its preservation. We are not striving for applause but endeavoring to preserve to future generations the benefits of civilization. If there is any American in public life who is considering only those things which are popular, his sense of duty must be horizoned by the confines of his own immediate constituency.

I have heard the question asked upon this floor, "What is the difference between universal training and universal service on the one hand and 'selective conscription' on the other?" One distinguished Senator, for whom I have a very high regard, in raising this question has said that he is in favor of the former but is not clear in his mind that he can support the pending measure. The question is a very simple one and can be simply answered. Academically there may be a difference in the two terms; in effect, there is but a single difference. The bill for universal training, which I most emphatically favor, will prepare us for some future war. This measure will so equip us that we may participate in this war, and thus perform our duty as a civilized nation in the pending struggle against barbarism.

I make bold to assert that had we a universal training and service measure upon our statute books, and in operation for a year or more, we would now have no necessity for a conscription bill. Because of the failure of past Congresses to make proper provision for such an emergency as this we are compelled to resort to the measure now before the Senate, which, it should be noted, authorizes the President "to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Another measure, either the so-called Chamberlain bill, or something along the same line, must follow the enactment of the bill now under consideration to furnish a permanent system of national defense.

The words "universal" and "compulsory" are, in effect, so far as the present question is concerned, identical, for universal training and service can only be secured by compulsion. Theoretically such is not the case. Practically it is.

If the truth were told, the main objection to "conscription" is to the word itself. The term "compulsory military service" has no more terrors for me than compulsory taxation or compulsory education, against the latter of which there was a general and vigorous protest when the system was originally suggested not so many years ago.

The issue before the Senate to-day is whether we shall have a uniform "draft" of all men between 19 and 25 years of age to raise 500,000 men for a national army, under the plan worked out by the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War, or whether this Congress shall insist that the country adopt a plan to call for 500,000 volunteers in opposition to the best judgment of those who have studied the problem and believe the "draft" system is the only safe one to apply at this time.

There have been many opinions expressed. One has been that if we impose the "draft" system we might face a revolution. If this Government has become so weak that it can not enforce its own authority, it is time for us to know it.

I have had numerous young men say in my own State, where the volunteers are slow in enlisting—it costing, as I am told, about \$100 to get a single recruit—"I want my Government to tell me to go. I am willing to go, but I want to know that the other fellow is called, too."

Former President Roosevelt, who may be recognized as the father of the preparedness propaganda, says:

Military service should no more be optional in a democracy than should the payment of taxes. One should be accepted as an obligation just as much as the other. * * * Military training should be recognized as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor with all our citizens. In a free democracy the nation has a right to the services of its citizens both in war and in peace.

Former President Taft, who prior to entering the White House had served at the head of the War Department, has repeatedly declared his belief that only by a resort to compulsory military service could the perpetuity of the Republic be insured.

Another former Secretary of War, Luke E. Wright, has thus expressed himself:

The fact is that the volunteer is not a reliable soldier, and any people that leans upon him leans upon a broken reed. * * * That system is a failure. It is wrong in principle and it is bad in practice. No people have been able to fight a long-continued war, to endure a strain upon all their resources under the volunteer system.

Still another able Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, in a recent magazine article, says:

The volunteer system has become obsolete, not only because modern war has grown to such gigantic dimensions that the necessary force will not be obtained by volunteering, but even more clearly because, with the growth of democracy, the unfairness and injustice of such a system has become increasingly apparent.

The senior commanding officer of our Army, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, has thus presented his views:

The volunteer spirit is splendid, but the volunteer system is absolutely insecure. It is false. Analyze the country's military history and it will be seen that it was because of the volunteer system that our wars lasted so long.

Mr. President, an army to be efficient must be of one mind, and that mind the commander in chief's; otherwise it will not have morale and spirit. An army to be effective must be a machine.

We are fighting the most efficient army in existence. If Germany conquers in this war, she conquers the world. No other nation of strength remains to stop her supremacy, and her long-known and cherished ambition to attain the hegemony of the world will be accomplished, and your children and mine will be brought up under Prussian philosophy, and the world will go back to the Dark Ages in compliance with a Hohenzollern policy.

Let us not commit the unpardonable blunder of building upon the fact that this Nation has in the final analysis emerged victor in her several wars.

This is not a war with Mexico. This is not a war with Spain. This is not a war with an effete, decadent nation, lacking in virility and sunk into a state of desuetude. This is not a war where any nation can muddle through.

This struggle, which destiny and not choice has compelled us to engage in, is fought against the most brutal foe the world has ever produced. He has insidiously, relentlessly planned it for decades, while the balance of the world slept, utilizing all the physical and mental forces of a war-mad dynasty, and we are face to face with a proposition, a condition, that is appalling.

"Old things have passed away; all things have become new." This is particularly so of modern warfare. It is worse than idle to suggest that America's participation in this struggle of the ages should be predicated upon anything we have done in past wars.

We must exercise the highest degree of efficiency. We must put every ounce of our national character into the scale. We must mobilize every fiber of our being. There must be a coordination of all our assets—spiritual, intellectual, and physical. Only thus may we expect to be a real factor in evolving order from the chaos which now envelops the world and to bring about a peace that shall endure.

Do not let us trifle with the eternal verities when the earth is aflame. Let us not falter and dawdle. Let us not depend upon theories which have been long since exploded, or systems that have always failed. In a word, let us give America at once that plan of military action now employed by every one of the European belligerents, compulsory service; without which our efforts will be futile and our aid to our allies pitifully inadequate.

Why should we, Mr. President and Senators, set our opinions against the absolutely unanimous judgment of the military world? Our President, the Commander in Chief of our Army, has strongly urged nondependence upon the volunteer system. So have former Presidents Roosevelt and Taft. So has the present Secretary of War. So have four of his predecessors, Lindley M. Garrison, Elihu Root, Henry L. Stimson, and Luke E. Wright. So has the senior major general, Leonard Wood. So have the General Staff officers of the Army.

If the technical judgments of these men are to be ignored and the opinions of laymen are to be accepted, why not abolish the War College and wipe West Point out of existence?

An able officer of our Regular Army has said:

I ask of you not to confound valor with effectiveness.

Few men are heroic or even brave by instinct. It is the nature of man to shrink from danger and death. The soldierly quality is not congenital. The man-at-arms, unlike the poet, is not born. He is the creature of man's handiwork pure and simple.

To fit a body of men to face the bayonet, the machine gun, or the gas bomb requires something more than abstract courage. It is only by a tedious process of welding, molding, and pounding into a state of perfect discipline that soldiers are made.

An hour's maneuvering in an armory each week, a few days spent in a camp each summer, these do not make a soldier. The mills of the military gods grind slowly and the finished product comes only as the result of a laborious, strenuous, crucial process. The weaklings fall by the wayside, the fit survive.

The Cincinnatus of apocryphal history is an interesting figure to ponder upon, yet no man need question what his fate would be as a participant in twentieth century warfare. The "Minute Men of '76" would survive about a minute in the trenches before Verdun or on the bloody slopes of St. Quentin. Frequently have I heard it said within the past few days: "Let us try the volunteer system, and then if that proves a failure we can resort to conscription."

Was there ever a suggestion more amazing, more delusive?

Try the volunteer system! Have not we Americans tried it for nearly a century and a half, and always at a frightful cost? Did not the British try it for nearly two years and then abandon it to save the nation from annihilation?

Do not men know that procrastination is not only the thief of time but the thief of opportunity as well—opportunity that may never return?

At a time like the present, when dynasties are toppling and the crushing and crashing of nations go on about us, can we afford to procrastinate, to temporize, to fritter away precious days "trying" systems and policies which have always failed and always will fail?

"Try the volunteer system," indeed! If we resort again to that obsolete program, and then at the end of a year start in to inaugurate the compulsory system the war will be over without the firing of an American gun. Either we will be vassals of Prussianism or the laughingstock of the civilized world, for in vain will have been uttered the inspiring appeal of America's present-day Peter the Hermit, who said:

Let us pay with our bodies for our soul's desire. Let us without one hour's unnecessary delay put the American flag on the battle front in this great world war for democracy and civilization and for the reign of justice and fair dealing among the nations of mankind.

In carrying out the military program of our Government, we are not preparing for the present alone. We do not merely aim to aid in bringing to an end this Hohenzollern-inspired war. We are laying the foundations for all future contingencies, for any recrudescence of savagery which may seek to disrupt the social fabric of society and shackle the civilized world.

Lend no ear to that blind sentimentalist who predicts that there will be no more wars—the same disciple of pacifism and passivity who, in the spring of 1914, uttered the same prophecy.

In spite of the fact that she was a victor in 1871, Germany's memory was long and she struck again in 1914. Her memory will be equally long in the case of the United States. For a time, if defeated now, she will sing her hymn of hate in a minor key, but she will sing it just the same. Then, when least expected she will cry "Gott strafe America!" And the blow will fall. Let us be ready.

In closing my remarks, Mr. President, I want to call upon my colleagues and the Nation at large to conduct this war upon the high plane and for the sublime purposes enunciated in a speech recently delivered by the greatest of living Englishmen, Lloyd-George, who said:

"We have been living in a sheltered valley for generations. We have been too comfortable and too indulgent, many, perhaps, too selfish, and the stern hand of fate has scourged us to an elevation where we can see the everlasting things that matter for a nation—the great peaks we have forgotten of honor, duty, patriotism, and, clad in glittering white, the towering pinnacle of sacrifice, pointing like a rugged finger to heaven.

"We shall descend into the valley again, but as long as the men and women of this generation last they will carry in their hearts the image of these mighty peaks whose foundations are not shaken, though Europe and even the whole world rock and sway in the convulsions of a great war."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I voted for the resolution declaring war on Germany, and I believe I voted right. I voted for the bond issue to prosecute that war, and I believe that was a right vote, and before we get through with this bill I am going to vote for a measure that will prosecute this war to the best of this Nation's ability.

Germany had sunk our ships and drowned our citizens. She had taken away our rights on the high seas. She had even joined or tried to join with other nations in forming an alliance to overrun our country and divide up our territory between them. Under these circumstances, Mr. President, no American, in my judgment, could take any other course than to vote for war against this Nation that had so disregarded our rights.

I despise German militarism. Indeed, I go further than that and I say that I despise militarism wherever it may be. It has no place in a free country. I admire the German people, but I believe that the German Kaiser is the greatest criminal on the face of the earth to-day. I hope the Hohenzollern dynasty will go down, and go down forever, in this conflict. I have no sympathy with the dynasty nor with the head of it, and I want to

wage this war in the quickest way to rid the world of this despot.

Holding these views, the question arises, What shall be the course of this country in organizing an army to fight Germany? The majority of the committee of which I happen to be a member has brought in a report recommending what is commonly called the selective draft plan—not universal service, not universal training, but a selective draft of a comparatively few of our citizens; not a plan that takes in all men of military age and imposes the military burdens equally, but a plan that takes in the boys of our country and seeks to have us wage war against this great German nation of trained and seasoned fighters with boys between 19 and 25 years of age.

Let us see for a moment what the bill does and how these boys are obtained. In the first place, the Secretary of War tells us that under the terms of this bill we can not begin to organize until the 1st of next August, and it may be September or October before the arrangements are completed; and then it will take from 10 to 12 months to train our troops. Next August is a long time off, gentlemen of the Senate. What are we to do between now and then to prepare our country for this great conflict that we have undertaken?

Well, as testified to by the Secretary, we begin, after the passage of the bill, to enumerate these boys between 19 and 25. We have got to prepare rules and regulations to enumerate them, and then send out to every county and precinct in the United States and get them enrolled, and then, when we get them enrolled, there will be about 6,000,000 of them, it is estimated—about a million to the year. When we get the 6,000,000, what is the next step? Why, we have to assort out the fit from the unfit. It is estimated that 42 per cent are physically unfit and 58 per cent are good for service. In round numbers, that will leave about 3,500,000 men that are selected in the first instance; and then we have got to appoint other officers of the Government to pass upon exemptions. We have a long list of exemptions in this bill, many exemptions, and the general estimate is that probably 500,000 of these boys will be eliminated by the exemptions in the bill, and that will leave us the 3,000,000 men out of whom to get the first 500,000 under the terms of the bill.

How are we going to get them? By selective conscription. Imagine for a moment how this will work. The President does not select. The Secretary of War does not select. Some Army officer selects which one of the six he will take in each community in order to get the 500,000. You gentlemen who have been talking and believing, and honestly believing in universal service, in putting the burden of the defense of the country upon all of the people, can you not see what a small body it finally falls on? The whole burden is put upon less than 3 per cent of our population to carry on this war, and they are boys, under the terms of this bill, a large portion of whom are not old enough to make a contract! These boys are not even citizens.

That is what this bill does unamended. It is not universal service at all; it is partial service. And did you ever stop to think that that might be the reason why it is quite popular in some quarters? There are many people in this country who would like to see the burden put on the other fellow, and no doubt there are great numbers of the 97,000,000 of our population that are easily content to let one-sixth of the 3,000,000 boys do our fighting for us by selection—selective conscription—under the terms of this bill.

You may say, after that exposition of it, "Why are you going to vote for it, then?" I am going to vote for it on two grounds. One is that I believe we will get the men, and we have got to have the men. We are in this war, and we have got to fight it. The other one is that under the terms of this bill the whole machine goes out at the end of the war. Those are the grounds on which I am going to support this bill, with an amendment for volunteers at first, if it is possible to get it put on here.

With that general statement as to the provisions of the bill, it is a question for this Senate, for this Congress. If you want to adopt the most partial system that it is possible for you to adopt, vote down all amendments and put the burden of this war on the 3,000,000 young men, 500,000 of them going out in the first instance, and then selecting 500,000 more from time to time as the days roll by.

Some say, "Why, this eliminates politics." Can we be told that? Why, Senators, do you not know that when they come to select one out of the six in each of our States, every kind of political influence is going to be brought to bear to have this man or that man excused out of the six in each instance? And we are going to do it, too. In my judgment, it is a question of whether you want to adopt the most partial and unfair system, or whether you are willing that the burdens of the defense of our country may fall on as many of our citizens as possible.

Now, I want to read for just a moment my amendment. It is very simple. I do not change the wording of this bill at all.

It does not interfere with any provision of it. It does not delay it a moment. It goes right along; but I just add as a separate section, on page 2 of the bill, this:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to raise 500,000 volunteers under the provisions of "An act to provide for the raising of the volunteer forces of the United States in times of actual or threatened war," approved April 25, 1914, in so far as the same is not inconsistent with the terms of this act; and he shall immediately call out and train 500,000 volunteers. Should that number not enlist within 90 days, all deficiencies shall be secured by draft as herein provided.

Is that a good amendment? The Senate said so on March 3, 1914, just three years ago. The distinguished chairman of our committee brought in a report on the volunteer bill three years ago in February, in which he said that the volunteer bill that we put on the statute books then was approved by all of the expert military authorities in our country. All of them were for it then, and yet three years pass by, and now all of those same experts, we are told, are against it. I have been much interested in some of the statements made by the distinguished Senator when reporting the bill in 1914. In this present report very considerable argument has been raised about the volunteer system; that it has been a failure; that it is undemocratic; that it is ineffective in our country and in others, and yet, just three years ago, on February 20, 1914, Senator CHAMBERLAIN said as to this volunteer system which afterwards became the law, and which he now decries, as follows:

The legislation now proposed (the volunteer legislation) has received the approval of the military authorities and has been pending in various forms before Congress for the last seven years. It has been urgently recommended by every Secretary of War since the incumbency of Mr. Root. Its general purpose is to provide for a complete organization of any force of volunteers that may hereafter be called out, whether that force be a single regiment or an army of a million men. It harmonizes with the militia organization under the Dick bill, and with the existing laws governing the Regular Army. It is elastic and flexible in that the organization of the volunteer forces is to conform to that of the Regular Army, future changes in the latter automatically carrying corresponding changes in the former, as is now prescribed by law for the militia.

This bill was duly passed by the Senate by unanimous vote and received the approval of President Wilson on April 25, 1914, just three years ago. And yet this law that was put upon the statute books under a favorable report of the distinguished Senator from Oregon is now declared wholly ineffective, useless, and of no value. I voted for that bill believing that it was a good bill at the time, and believe it is a good bill now and that it ought to be used. Now let us see what my amendment does. It simply calls out 500,000 volunteers, and they have to enlist before August 1 if the bill passes by May 1, or perhaps earlier if the bill passes earlier. How is that going to hurt or interfere with the terms of this bill? Not at all, because it does not interfere with a line of it. They can go right along with their enumeration, right along with their process of selection and exclusion and exemption. It does not change a word or a line. It does not delay it a moment; but what does it do in the meantime? Why, unless I am greatly mistaken in American citizens, it will give us an army which will be training in the various mobilization camps of the United States in less than 30 days.

When have Americans not come forward at a time of crisis like this? They have always volunteered. When have they become so degenerate that they are not willing voluntarily to fight for their country? Is it possible that we can believe that the sons of men who fought in the Civil War on both sides, or the sons of men who fought in the Spanish War, have become so degenerate that they will not fight for their country in a crisis like this? I do not believe it, and I have no sympathy with that idea. But let us see for a moment.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator excuse me for just a few moments?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a line of thought, and I shall be glad to answer any questions just a little later. I am a new Member here, and I shall appreciate it very much.

What happens? Why, they say: "If we have this volunteer system, we can not have trained men." Is it any harder to train volunteers than to train conscripts? I do not want to send abroad or anywhere else, to fight, men who are not trained, and there is no purpose here to do it. We are in this fight, and my belief is that we ought to begin, and begin at once, to prepare our Army to win this fight.

You can not win a fight and put off for three months the beginning of your organizing. That is no way to fight. Why, Germany will think we do not mean what we say when we only begin to enumerate and count up our forces. Ah, but let them begin to organize and train in the field, and you will find that it

will be the greatest object lesson that could possibly be given Germany in this conflict.

Well, now, I say, time is of the essence of this thing. We want an army, and we want it at the earliest possible moment, and we want men drilling in the field at the earliest possible moment. I say that if you adopt this amendment that I have offered, under the terms of the act as it stands to-day you will have an army of 500,000 men actually drilling by August 1, the very first date upon which the draft plan can even be started.

What is the objection? Why, the first objection is that under the volunteer plan you can not get the officers. Let us see about that.

For 500,000 men it will take 18,538 officers. We have not got them. Under the volunteer plan we have got to get them from the body of the country. When we come to the conscript plan we have got even fewer, because we cut off our real material. Under the conscript plan what have we got? Why, they say: "If you adopt the volunteer plan it will make the selection of the officers political." There can not be any greater mistake than that. The President appoints every officer under the volunteer plan, just as he appoints every officer under the conscript plan. There is no difference in the law as to the one or the other. But what is the real difference? The real difference is that we have got, among the body of the people men who have been educated in military schools, men who have seen service in the Spanish-American War, men who have seen service in the Regular Army, men who have seen service as officers in the National Guard but now do not belong to it, men who have seen service at Plattsburg, and you can not get them. They are practically eliminated under the terms of this bill unamended.

But how are you going to get the officers for the conscript plan? Well, the plan is this: They say they have a Reserve Officers' Corps, and they have got 8,000 men on it. That is true. I doubt if there is a Member of this body who has not put a few officers in that corps. You know how it is done. A young man writes to you and says he wants to join that corps. He has heard about this conscription, and he wants to go in as an officer rather than as a conscript; and I do not blame him. He gets three of his friends to give him a certificate of good character, and then he tells the department whether he has ever had any military experience and whether he has been at a military school a year, or whether he has been at Plattsburg; and if he has the right kind of backing and can stand a limited examination, he goes in on the Officers' Reserve Corps; and that is the kind of officers they are going to have under the conscript plan.

In addition to that, they are going to establish camps all over the country, at various places in the country, to train these officers. With troops? Oh, no. Actual training? Oh, no. What kind of training are they going to get? Well, they are going to be given an academic training by Army officers—good training, no doubt; but what is the best kind of training? It is where the officers are trained with troops.

What will happen under the volunteer plan if we get it? Why, under the volunteer plan, if we get it, men who have served as officers in the Spanish-American War, men who stand well in their community and whose friends are willing to go to war with them, men who are willing to trust themselves to officers who are more or less experienced, will select these officers in the first instance, and they can be weeded out by the War Department if they are not of the right kind. But at all events, I say that these officers who have had experience, who have had training, who have seen service, many of them, are far more effective officers than the young men that we are putting into the Army Officers' Reserve Corps; and that is what you have to decide on that proposition.

Senators, you are asked to decide upon these two plans. Either take them both together or exclude the volunteer plan; and when you exclude the volunteer plan, what do you do? Well, let us see what we do.

In the first place, every man over 25 years of age who has served in the Regular Army will be excluded under this plan. He can not go to this war. He might desire to volunteer; he might desire to be a noncommissioned officer and go with a whole battalion or regiment; but, "No; you are excluded. We are going to put in conscripts instead." That is one of the military assets of our country. We have spent large sums in paying some of them retired pay; we have spent large sums upon these men in the past to use them in the event of a crisis just such as we have now; and yet under the plan as proposed, unamended, you would throw away that military asset.

And here we have had the National Guard for years.

We have spent many millions of dollars to build up the National Guard, and it may be misspent and it is misspent, as

Senator WILLIAMS says to me on the side, if you throw it away. They have been trained. They are one of the military assets of this country that this bill discards. All members of the National Guard over 25 years of age, and it is those men who volunteered and went to the Spanish War, many of them good soldiers and many of them who would be glad to go again, but being over 25 years of age now, there is another military asset gone.

In the next place, we have been assisting for 40 years, through military colleges known as land-grant colleges and a number of other military colleges lately, to educate and train these young men in the colleges. It is estimated, and I think very correctly, that there are at least 400,000 of these young men who have been trained in colleges who are over 25 years of age.

Every one of the 400,000, trained at the expense of the National Government in part, is excluded from going into this war by the terms of the pending bill.

Lately, as you all know, we have spent two or three million dollars—I believe we appropriated \$3,500,000 the other day—for training camps throughout the country at which men between 19 and 45 were to be trained, as I recall it. We are training about 50,000 of them a year—we have been for two or three years—nine-tenths or more of whom are over 25 years of age. That is another of the military assets of our country. They can not come in under this plan if they are over 25. They might want to go to this war; they might want to fight for their country. It is just probable that some of them might be patriotic. They inherited some patriotism from their forefathers. It is just possible they may not all be like those in New Jersey, if my distinguished friend from that State is correct about the statement he made concerning his own State or his own young men. But they are cut out. They can not go, however patriotic, however courageous, however available they may be.

There are five distinct military assets of this country that the Government has spent money to train, and they are just frankly laid aside and left out of this bill. For what reason? I do not know what the reasons are. I can easily see that the plans proposed here of selective conscription have some claims to popularity. I think a selective draft of the Senate by which 3 per cent of it was forced to go to the front and fight in this war would be pretty popular with the other 97 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. After the selection was made.

Mr. McKELLAR. After the selection was made, especially; but if you arrange the method of selection to begin with and let it only apply to 3—as I believe there are 3 gentlemen in the Senate under 40 years of age—if such a law were passed, if such a thing were possible, that those under 40 should go to the front and fight for their country, I do not believe the other 93 would have any very great trouble in agreeing to an act like that.

Mr. STONE. It would be a good example.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be a fine example, but pretty hard on the three and unfair as a policy.

Now, further, I want to talk about some objections which have been raised to the volunteer amendment. Some say we can not have a plan like this because it is part volunteer and part conscript. That is true. We have got that right now, have we not? Of course I am a new man here, and I have not exactly learned as yet the methods by which we reach conclusions in this body, but I have been struck with one thing, that gentlemen rise in their places, inveigh against the volunteer system in one breath, and in the next breath they are telling what a splendid volunteer system we have already in this act. Some one said we can get 300,000 more volunteers under this act, another gentleman said 400,000, and another 500,000, and one gentleman said here this morning we could get 900,000 under this act. Let us be frank about it. That is not the intention of this act. As I remember the testimony of Mr. Secretary Baker, he was very frank about it. If this act goes through without amendment it is not intended to get any more volunteers. It is intended to substitute the conscript system for the volunteer system. That is what it seeks to do. They are just waiting to see what is going to be done.

In talking about the volunteer system the advocates of conscription say it is a good thing as far as it goes in this act. I want to say this: If the volunteer system is a good thing, why do they not accept it in a way that will make it effective? Why do they not accept it in a way that will give us 500,000 of more or less trained soldiers in less than 30 days, which it would do, in my judgment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand the Senator does not want to be interrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would be delighted to be interrupted a little later.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am absolutely seeking information. My mind is entirely open upon this proposition. I want the best information that I can get. I have been attracted by the Senator's statement that it will be the policy of the War Department to permit the acceptance of no volunteers in case the draft bill goes through. Will the Senator oblige me by reading the testimony or statement of the Secretary of War? If he has it here, will he quote it or refer me to it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony of the Secretary before the Committee on Military Affairs was not taken down and transcribed, but as I recollect the statement it was that they are having a hard time getting volunteers now; that they did not know whether they would want to come in for seven years or for the term of the war; and then they explained that they expected them to go in for the term of the war; that the enlistment was to be for the term of the war, but they were not getting men, and that they had absolutely prohibited any increase in the units of the National Guard, and did not expect to add any more units to it, but at all events merely to fill up the ranks at present of the Regular Army as it now exists and of the National Guard as it now exists. That is my recollection of what was said.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] was seeking information. I have understood it to be the position of the Secretary of War that any number of men might volunteer their services, not that volunteer organizations as such would be received as separate units in the aggregate of the Army, but that as individual volunteers any number would be welcome to be incorporated in the organization as it is to be made up under the bill. I should like to know whether that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Secretary so testified. I read his testimony in the House hearings, but I repeat he gave me the impression that he regarded the volunteer system as an absolute failure and that it was the purpose of the department to do away with it at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator, of course.

Mr. BRADY. The Senator advised us that he does not desire to be interrupted, for the reason that he is a new hand here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I am a new hand.

Mr. BRADY. I just want to say that he is a new hand, but he has demonstrated by his very eloquent and forceful argument that he is not a new hand at the business. There has been so much said about the testimony of the Secretary of War before the Military Affairs Committee, and there seemed to be so many different opinions as to what the Secretary said at that time, that I took it upon myself to write the Secretary a letter and ask him certain questions. His reply, I think, entirely explains all this matter. I will not interrupt the Senator at this time, but I wish to say that after the Senator has concluded I will read into the Record the letter which I received this morning from the Secretary of War.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I am in error in any way, I shall be delighted to have the Senator or the Secretary correct me. I just give my impression of the verbal testimony that I heard.

Mr. BRADY. It is simply an honest misunderstanding.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, assuming that men can be added as volunteers, it is to fill up units all over the country. A man volunteers in Memphis; he may be put in a Vermont company or regiment or battalion. He volunteers in California and he may go into a New York brigade. I do not think that is a fair system of volunteering. We all know that, especially when we send troops to a foreign war, men from the same locality like to go in the same company and the same organization as far as possible, so as to be with their friends. Homesickness is one of the trials of any army, and especially when you send them to a far country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will in just a moment. May I first make this explanation? I have not very much more to say in my remarks, and when I get through then I would be delighted to answer any question. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator from New Hampshire now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply want to make an observation along the line the Senator has just spoken. An instance came to my attention to-day where two brothers enlisted expecting to be together in the Army. One has been sent to Texas and the other does not know where he is going to be sent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for the illustration.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the beauty of the present volunteer system.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the defect; I know the Senator meant the word "beauty" in that sense. It is a defect in the present system of volunteering. If this volunteer system is so good, as far as it goes in this bill, why not make it effective by letting the men come in independent organizations?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice that in the Senator's remarks he seemed to assert that in the training camps which are intended to equip and fit and train and drill officers who in their turn shall fit, train, and drill recruits there is nobody above 25 years of age. Am I correct about that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; officers can come in—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I so understood him; and if so, he has misunderstood the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad the Senator called my attention to that, because if I made such a statement it was in error, and I can not believe I made it; at all events, I did not mean to make that statement. What I meant to say was that the vast majority of the young men at present in the Officers' Training Corps are young men who are not over 25 years of age. I know that is true of those coming from my State. I have recommended a couple of hundred or more in the last 35 or 40 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the men who received training during the Spanish-American War and for the ex-cadets of the military academies of the country where the military course has been recognized as equivalent to a Regular Army training the chief use will be as second lieutenants, first lieutenants, captains, for the purpose of training the other men who are coming in. That is the highest utility for them, and I want to say that the War Department has published to the entire country the fact that they desire the first 10,000 who are going into training to be men of somewhat mature age, and the War Department has given its reasons for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that they are seeking some of the better material. But I will say this: The Senator will find upon examination that the War Department has virtually eliminated from this war the five classes of military assets which I have heretofore enumerated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will find in a memorandum the War Department has drawn up—probably it sent a copy to the Senator; the department sent one to me and to other Senators—the department states just what I am talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. The President will have exactly the same right to appoint those officers who are being trained in the volunteer forces that he has the right to appoint them in the conscript force, the only difference being that in the conscript force it will be limited to the officers in the Army Officers' Reserve Corps and those others prescribed by this act. If we have a volunteer force, it will not be limited to the officers who present themselves with the volunteers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon me just one moment longer?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is a material difference besides what the Senator has mentioned. When these men get through with the three months' training in the camps they have to stand a military and mental examination, and the Government thereby becomes satisfied that they are fit and equipped. In the volunteer units of which you speak, where the men select their own officers, the equipment of the officers is absolutely unknown to the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if he had examined the act approved April 25, 1914, providing for a volunteer army, he would have seen that the President is given the absolute authority to name every officer in the volunteer force. I can not subscribe to the proposition that you can make an efficient army officer by training him three months at a training camp.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, after they have gone out with those units.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; he has the same right under that law to name the officers as he has under this bill to name the officers for the conscripted troops.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But under this system he names the officers after they have passed an examination.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has a right to demand an examination of any officer in either volunteer or conscript force.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To disorganize the units so far as the existing officers are concerned and reorganize them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. If the Senator will examine the law, he will find that the provision for the appointment of officers under the volunteer-army act of 1914 gives precisely the same power that the President has to appoint officers under this act.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Right along that line, and seeking further information—

Mr. McKELLAR. If I am able to give the Senator any information, I shall take pleasure in doing so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand the Senator's statement, if a unit should present itself under the volunteer system for service to the Government, and if the unit comes, of course, fully organized with its officers chosen, and the United States Government should be of the opinion that that unit is poorly officered, in the sense that the officers are not qualified, the power remains in the Federal Government to discharge them from their official place and to substitute in lieu of them fit and competent officers?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, and not only that, the Government has the right to refuse to accept them until they have stood an examination and qualified themselves as officers, which means just this, that in the volunteer forces there will be a greater number of competent officers for the President to choose from, and he has exactly the same right in every instance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, if I understand correctly the Senator from Tennessee, he is making this point—I want to see the drift of his argument—that the contention made by the advocates of the conscript system, who are at the same time the opponents of the volunteer system, namely, that the volunteer system will produce a force improperly officered is not well taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. That claim is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It struck me that that was a very forcible point made against the volunteer system, and I wanted it cleared up.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be a strong point if it was correct. If the Senator will read the act of 1914 he will find a provision precisely the same for the appointment of officers under a volunteer system as under this bill, and by the way the same classes of our citizens are enumerated in the two cases, with one slight exception.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the Senator is mistaken in the position he takes. The bill as it is now before the Senate for consideration provides for taking into the service units of the National Guard as now organized.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not speaking of the National Guard at all. That is out of it, because they do come in in the same way, except instead of the act of 1914 they come in under the act of June 3, 1916.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator is proposing that additional units shall be taken from the States into the Regular Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am proposing that the President shall call out 500,000 volunteers under the time-honored system which has been in vogue in this country ever since this was a country, under the amended law of 1914, which gives him the same right to appoint officers of such a volunteer force as he has under this bill to appoint the officers of a conscripted force.

Now, if the Senate will indulge me just a few moments longer, I want to have a word or two to say about the volunteer system.

The history of the volunteer system, Mr. President, is the history of the warfare of the Anglo-Saxon race. There never has been in the history of the world since there was an Anglo-Saxon race a time when any nation of that race ever resorted to conscription at the beginning of any war. The distinguished Senator, my friend from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], for whom I have the highest admiration and regard, as I understood his speech a few moments ago, undertook to argue that all our wars, the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the War with Spain, had all been gigantic mistakes. I do not so read American history. I may not have the comprehension to understand it, but as I do my belief is that we won every war that we have undertaken. Mistakes were made, of course; they are made in every war; but what has been the result? The result is that America has won. It is easy enough for self-constituted experts who have never been in a battle, 140 years, or even 50 years, after the war to criticize the mistakes of those great heroes of our country who won the wars; and thinking men do not pay any attention to such criticisms. Here a little nation, a little puny aggregation of States along the Atlantic seaboard just a little over 100 years ago, under this system of volunteers has step by step, war after war, added to her territory until to-day she is the greatest nation on the face of the earth under the present system of volunteers.

Are we going to traduce the memory, the courage, and the patriotism of our Revolutionary forefathers by saying that their system was a mistake—that they ought to have done better than they did? They won that war. Should we not be proud of that success? Is it becoming in us at this late day to belittle their courage and patriotism?

Then we come to the War of 1812. Some say we did not win it, and we did have some very disagreeable things happen in that war, but it was all cured by the victory at New Orleans. We won the Mexican War by volunteers. Then came the Civil War; and, by the way, it is said here that volunteering then was a failure. It won the war. The Spanish War was won by volunteers.

How can any thinking man familiar with the history of his country say that the volunteer system, under which this country has grown from 3,000,000 to 100,000,000 people, from a puny little aggregation of States to the greatest Nation on earth, the most powerful, the richest, the ablest, and the best Nation of men on the face of the earth—how can it be said that we have made nothing but a series of failures in war? The contention is ridiculous.

Sometimes it is said that America is not a warlike Nation. Think of five great wars in a little over 100 years. We are distinctly a warlike Nation, and the good part of it is that we won all of them.

It is easy enough for Senators to pick flaws in the proceedings after the fact, and for great self-constituted military experts in military—and civil life, too—to tell the country how those wars could have been won more easily or more economically; but the facts are that they were won, and it is results that tell. They were won under the volunteer system, and I venture the assertion that if the Congress stands by the volunteer system to-day, when we get through with this fight with Germany, though she is the most powerful nation on earth, we will have won again.

England has just raised a volunteer army of 5,000,000 men. She resorted to conscription and secured a million more. In other words, her army is five-sixths volunteer and one-sixth conscript, and there is not a better army on the face of the globe to-day than the British Army. Then, there is little Canada, with just 8,000,000 of people, and she has raised 400,000 troops by the volunteer plan, and sent over 300,000 already to Europe, where they are fighting for the allies. And there is Australia, that has contributed a like number to the allies by the same volunteer system. Indeed, Australia by a referendum turned down conscription. And here is the United States, with 21,000,000 men of military age, that has always followed the volunteer system, and yet we are asked to institute in the very beginning, without giving any man the right to volunteer—we are asked to pass a conscript law and force our young men to go.

But it is claimed by some of our so-called military experts that the volunteer system has been a failure. We have tried it in five wars, and we have won all of those wars. But they then reply that those wars could have been won easier and with less loss of life and property with a conscript system. Oh, Mr. President, it is easy to pick flaws after the fact, but it is the result that counts; and the result has always been under the volunteer system we have had the highest success, and after the war was over our soldiers have passed into the peaceful pursuits of man, as is proper under our system of government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, whether we adopt the conscript plan or the volunteer plan the present officers of the War Department will very largely have control of those forces, so that from the standpoint of personal interest no reason occurs to me why they should favor one plan rather than the other. How does the Senator account for the fact that the War College and nearly all the Regular Army officers who have made the profession of arms a study favor the conscription system?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not account for it at all; but I say to the Senator if he will look at the hearings before the House committee taken two or three weeks ago and printed, he will find, as I recall those hearings—and if I make a mistake I certainly have no desire to make one—the Secretary of War said that this was his plan, not a War College or General Staff plan, and that he submitted it to Gen. Scott, to Gen. Bliss, to Gen. Kuhn, and to Gen. Crowder, and the bill was drawn after those four officers had submitted the plan. That is my recollection of the testimony. That is a matter, however, that the record will show about. The General Staff was just as much in favor of the volunteer bill of 1914, which they now seek to set aside, as they

are now for this bill. The Senator will find the absolute facts in the record.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word—

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will merely ask a question at this time; but I yield to him.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall be very brief. I have not any doubt that Secretary Baker consulted experts. I have known him for a good many years, and I know that he is a man who never comes to a conclusion without having a reason for it that is satisfactory to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the same high opinion of Secretary Baker that the Senator has. I am a great admirer of the Secretary.

Mr. POMERENE. I have not any doubt that if Secretary Baker has accepted the advice of men at the head of the War College it is because it has met the approval of his own mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. President, having said that much about the volunteer system, I now come to the one that it is proposed at this late day in our history to substitute for it. I have taken the trouble to examine into the success or failure of the draft plan, hoping to be able to give Senators some information as to the success or failure of the draft plan. I want very briefly to give the latest experience that this Nation has had with that plan.

In 1863, when the Government of the United States was confronted with a situation of more extreme danger, perhaps, than it ever had been confronted with before or ever will be again, the Congress of the United States passed what was known as the draft bill. Now, mind you, this Nation was then fighting for the Government's life when this draft plan was passed. Volunteers had not come forward in sufficient numbers, and it was sought to supplement and to strengthen the armed forces of the United States by a draft law. Such a law was not passed at the beginning of the war, as we propose here, to supplement and to strengthen the Army, but it was passed more than two years after the war began. What happened? Well, here is what happened in the first instance: There were 2,700,000 men, in round numbers, raised by the Union in the Civil War, of whom 2,654,000, to be absolutely accurate, were raised by volunteering and a paltry 46,000 were raised by draft—less than 3 per cent. To be absolutely accurate, 2.3 per cent of the Union forces of the Civil War were raised by draft, and history does not record when any conscript in this country ever distinguished himself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait just one moment, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I was simply going to say that the figures given by Gen. Miles were a little over 50,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will explain that discrepancy. The reason that Gen. Miles gives those figures is that he included a few who were drafted who did not actually serve; but I am talking about the drafted men who served their country from 1863 to 1865. What happened? I can not better be accurate about a thing like this than to read a very short excerpt from a report by Gov. Seymour, the then governor of New York, to his legislature on January 5, 1864. I quote from him accurately, as follows:

Like results are conspicuous in all parts of our State and in all sections of the country—in New England, Pennsylvania, and the West. The attempt to fill our armies by drafting was abortive. While it gave no useful result, it disturbed the public mind; it carried anxiety and perplexity into the workshops, the fields, and the homes of our citizens. It not only fails to fill our armies but it produces discontent in the service; it is opposed to the genius of our political system; it alienates our people from the Government; it is injurious to the industrial pursuits of the country.

Gen. Miles has also recently testified that while he was down on the front fighting for his country, after this draft law was passed he had to withdraw regiments of trained troops to be sent back to New York and to other places to quell the riots that had been brought about by this undemocratic draft measure. That is the history of the draft in this country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will yield right there—

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will ask, was not that due to the fact that the State authorities of New York practically refused to sustain the carrying out of the volunteer law?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was due to the fact that in all instances where men have been free they have objected to be treated as slaves; it was due to the fact that we never have resorted to conscription except as a last resort to aid our country in time of peril; and when we have done it, it has been a failure. It is due to the fact that conscription has always been consid-

ered in this country as the most despicable form of military despotism.

Now, let us see one step further. Much has been said about the failure of the volunteer system, under which we have won all of our wars, but, as I said before, very little has been said about the failure of the draft system. I took occasion on the day before yesterday to write to The Adjutant General of the Army to give me the exact facts and figures as to what was done under the draft plan. This letter was written on yesterday, and is signed by Gen. McCain, The Adjutant General of the Army. He says:

It appears from the final report of the Provost Marshal General that the whole number of men drafted from the several States and Territories for the United States service under the enrollment act of March 3, 1863, and its amendments—

Think of it, now! The whole number enrolled—

was 776,829. Of that number 161,244 failed to report, 46,101 were discharged because the quota was full, 47,247 were discharged by order, 315,509 were exempted, 73,607 furnished substitutes, 86,724 paid commutation and were discharged, and 46,347 were held in the service.

That is the record of the draft system. Out of 776,000 men enrolled to fight for their homes, not in a foreign war, 46,000 conscripts were finally secured. Suppose we shall have that same result here, what will happen?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator excuse me for just one moment? Let me finish this statement.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. What will happen? Well, if the same proportion, the proposed conscript law would do this: If we enroll 6,000,000 young men and have the same result that we had in 1863 when the life of the country was at stake we will get 360,000 men out of the 6,000,000. That is what the result of the draft system was before.

It is said we now have a very different system; that at this time the Government is stronger, and that is so. I know it is so; but, Senators, are you going to substitute force for freedom? That is the question for us to decide.

Now I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator has just referred to the large number of men drafted and the comparatively small number who were afterwards accepted as conscripts. I had a letter this morning from a gentleman who was an officer in the Civil War, who quit the service as a captain, who made this explanation in part of the so-called failure of the draft system. I may say that I am not privileged to give this officer's name, but he is one of the leading lawyers of Ohio. He said that after the draft system had been inaugurated and the men drawn, nearly all of those men, when they found that they had been drafted, went personally and enlisted as volunteers; and that, while they appeared on the rolls as volunteers, it was largely because of the draft system. Can the Senator from Tennessee advise us as to whether or not that is correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know how correct that is; but I have no doubt, in my own mind, in future years in this body, when Senators are discussing the question of whether this draft measure is a failure or a success, that kind of specious argument will be used to mitigate the failure of the system.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, Mr. President, this man was himself a volunteer, and he served four years during the Civil War.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course there may be always individual instances and exceptions to the rule. We can not determine a policy of government, a policy of raising an army, by the experience of an individual in one war or another.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, does the Senator know whether or not that was general?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. POMERENE. I know this man, and I know that he is one of the most reputable men in Ohio. He himself, at the head of a company, was detailed to arrest many of the men who were drafted, and he afterwards took them into camp and permitted them to enlist as volunteers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Naturally, I have no knowledge of the facts to which the Senator refers.

Mr. POMERENE. That may explain very largely the small number of drafted men, of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Probably it may have had something to do with it. I have no doubt that when we arrest a number of these boys under the provisions of the present act we will mitigate the arrests as far as possible by getting them into the service without visiting upon them the penalties for not having voluntarily come in.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me further interrupt the Senator for just a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator does not make this distinction between the draft act of 1863 and the present proposed law. Under the act of 1863 men could buy immunity by paying \$300 in lieu of enlistment.

Mr. McKELLAR. And send a substitute.

Mr. POMERENE. And could send substitutes in their places. There is nothing like that in this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to express my very great admiration for the majority of the committee that they do not recommend any provision like that in this bill, and I think to that extent at least the pending measure is a great improvement on the draft act of 1863.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, there is another question I should like to ask the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator, but I hope I am not consuming too much of the time of the Senate. I have a little more to say.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am asking these questions of the Senator because I think he has given much study to the proposition he is advocating, and I have not heard the side of the subject to which he addresses himself discussed very much. Some considerations have been suggested which seemed to my mind rather strong arguments against the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. If I caught the point of the argument I heard yesterday by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]—and a very able argument it was—at one point he made this suggestion, which appealed to me as a rather forceful one: He said that while under the volunteer system it might be possible in the first instance to get units into the field at full strength, yet as the wastage proceeded, there not being any machinery for the recruiting of those to take the places made by this wastage, the volunteer system would prove ineffective. He instanced the case of some regiments in the Civil War reduced to a hundred men, yet retaining all their regimental officers. Under the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee proposing a volunteer plan is there anything to prevent that sort of possibility?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that question was troubling the Senator, I am delighted he asked me about it, for this reason: Under the terms of this bill, with my amendment incorporated in it, all the wastage will be taken care of.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the draft provisions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the draft provisions of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will it be, Mr. President?

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely. The draft features of this bill will remain in effect. The men will be enrolled. The volunteer feature of the amendment will not take the place of anything, except that the first 500,000 men will be drawn from the body of the country in a universal way, under the idea of universal obligation rather than partial obligation. They will simply be drawn from the body of the country first.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, Mr. President, I do not pretend to any intimate acquaintance with the various military acts, but from a cursory glance I have made of them I think the Senator must be in error as to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. I will read my amendment, which makes it perfectly plain.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to see how it does so.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is to be added as a separate section:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to raise 500,000 volunteers under the provisions of "An act to provide for the raising of the volunteer forces of the United States in times of actual or threatened war," approved April 25, 1914, in so far as the same is not inconsistent with the terms of this act, and shall immediately call out and train 500,000 volunteers. Should that number not enlist in 90 days, all deficiencies shall be secured by draft as herein provided.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; but that does not meet my question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I see what is in the Senator's mind, and the explanation—

Mr. WOLCOTT. If, after 90 days has expired and we have the 500,000 men in the field, and then wastage takes place, what is going to supply the deficiency?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will read the bill, he will see that by August 1 all of the enumerations will be made and the War Department will be training the second 500,000 men under the terms of the bill, which will proceed right straight along in its operation. My amendment does not interfere with it for a moment. We will have the other 500,000 ready to be trained. A million men are wanted; and the bill with my amendment will give 500,000 volunteers and 500,000 conscripts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, still my point is not cleared up. I should like the Senator from Tennessee to point out to me in the draft features of this bill wherein any of the men drafted can be utilized to make up the wastage in the volunteer force of 500,000 for which the Senator's amendment provides.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is perfectly plain, as the Senator will see if he will just read the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where is it found?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is found in the third paragraph of the bill, which my amendment leaves untouched, and which reads:

Third. To raise by draft as herein provided, organize, and equip an additional force of 500,000 enlisted men—

The Senator will notice that it reads "to raise by draft." Then in the fourth paragraph of the bill it is provided:

Fourth. The President is further authorized, in his discretion and at such time as he may determine, to raise and begin the training of an additional force of 500,000 men organized, officered, and equipped as provided for the force first mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this section.

That provides for the third 500,000 men under the terms of this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Which paragraph covers the point I have suggested?

Mr. McKELLAR. The third paragraph, on page 2, which reads:

Third. To raise by draft as herein provided, organize, and equip an additional force of 500,000 enlisted men, or such part or parts thereof as he may at any time deem necessary, and to provide the necessary officers, line and staff, for said force and for organizations of the other forces hereby authorized, or by combining organizations of said other forces—

I think that covers it. It is just as plain as the noonday sun that under the terms of this bill the President has the right to fill up not only deficiencies but any wastage or anything else.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that particular clause. It had escaped my eye.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as long as the Senator is being interrupted, perhaps he would not object to a further interruption.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am anxious to get through, but at the same time I am delighted to yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sure that no one will find fault with the Senator for extending his remarks as long as he likes, because they have been most interesting and instructive.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. What I want to call the attention of the Senator to is a phase of the subject which I do not think he has exhausted, if he has touched upon it, and that is this: The Senator has well said that we have been living under the blessings of the volunteer system. On December 15, 1916, the authorized strength of the Regular Army was 126,552, while the actual strength of the Army was 100,902 men, as I recall. In December, 1915, Congress authorized an increase in the enlisted strength of the Regular Army of 20,000 men; but, so far as I know, up to this time we have not even obtained the 20,000 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is in error about that. We now have about 150,000 men in the Regular Army. We had on the 1st of April, as I recall, according to the latest reports of the War Department, 129,000 or 130,000 men in the Regular Army, and there have been 20,000 or 25,000 added to the Regular Army by volunteers since then. Of course, we can add to the present units of that Army and bring it up to a strength of about 275,000, so that there is a chance for about 125,000 more men to volunteer.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is possible that the increase in the Regular Army which was authorized at the time to which I refer, has been met, but I know that a few months ago, I think perhaps as late as January of this year, we had not enlisted from December, 1915, to January, 1917, the 20,000 men authorized.

Mr. McKELLAR. But there have been a great many enlistments in the last month, so that the strength of the Regular Army is now about 150,000, and it is rapidly increasing. If we would give the men of America the opportunity to enlist, we would soon have an army.

That, Mr. President, brings me to the next point I have in mind, which is this: What we need, if we are going into this war, is an army; and we want that army now. I am opposed to putting it off until next August or next September or next October. Delay is always dangerous when it comes to war. A distinguished Confederate leader, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, who happened to live for some time in the same town where I now reside, once said, "The art of fighting a successful fight is to get there first with the most men." That is good doctrine to-day. We have got to train these troops, whether they are 19-year-old boys or whether they are men who have even had some previous experience under the volunteer system. Nobody wants to send raw recruits against a European

army, and nobody is going to do that; so we will have to train them. It is perfectly manifest that if we can get 500,000 men to volunteer within 30 days we will be just that much quicker getting a trained army. I am against even a day's delay.

It is a great misfortune, according to my notion, that a call for volunteers was not issued on the very next day after we declared war. In that event, by this time we would have had an army drilling in the camps of our country and being trained to fight its battles. That is what we ought to have done; but it is no longer useful to discuss what might have been done. It is what we are doing now, and I, for one, am opposed to postponing the creation of an army for three months and a half or four months and a half or six months, as the case may be, for I think it ought to be created now.

What are some of the objections to making provision for a volunteer system? It is said it will not do to have a half-and-half system—half volunteers and half conscripts. I do not blame anyone for making that contention. I should dislike to be a conscript in an army, and I think most of us feel the same way. I think very few would enjoy being put in that situation. I have not any sons myself, but I doubt if any Senator who has sons would like to have them conscripted in the Army. It is opposed to what real red-blooded men believe in.

But, Mr. President, we have a volunteer system now. There are at least 300,000 National Guardsmen and Regular Army men who have volunteered, and it is sought to raise 500,000 more by draft. The proportion will then be 3 to 5. Will it make the situation any worse to call for 500,000 volunteers, and then have 800,000 volunteers and 500,000 drafted soldiers?

It is proposed to raise an army of over a million men; everybody knows that. I think it is necessary; I think it ought to be done, and ought to be done as soon as possible; but it is not a logical objection to say that if we add a volunteer feature to this bill it will make our Army part volunteer and part conscript.

I now come to another feature. It is said that under the proposed draft system we will catch the "slackers." Well, I must confess that in the busy life I have lived I do not know very much about "slackers." I am not an expert on "slackers." I have not any respect for them in civil life, and I have not any respect for them in military life; and if it is proposed here to make an army of "slackers," we are doing a very poor business, because I do not believe men who are "slackers" in civil life will make very good soldiers. I would dislike to go out with a company of "slackers."

But let us see what we are doing to the "slackers." As I remarked here yesterday afternoon in the course of a question, most of the "slackers" that I know—if I know what that term signifies—are men over 25 years of age. Amongst the boys between 19 and 25 you rarely ever find any "slackers," as the term is commonly employed. If that is the case, what are we doing under this bill? Instead of making the "slackers" go forward and fight, we are giving them an honorable immunity from war. A man over 25 years old may be the worst "slacker" in the country, and yet he is given an honorable immunity under this bill. Senators say that one of the vices of raising volunteers is that the girls say to the boys they have no respect for them and will not associate with them unless they go to war, and those who will not go to war after such treatment are "slackers." That is one class of "slackers." Well, there will not be any such in this war, because all those over 25 years can reply to the girls, if anything like that is said, "I am barred from going to this war; the law bars me; I can not go. Congress has forbidden me to go." I say that argument is not sustained; that under the provisions of this bill that the "slackers" will be required to go. I say we will get no more "slackers" under the proposed partial selective draft system than we will get under the proposed system of volunteers.

Now, I come to another question—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just one moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me give an illustration of one kind of "slacker" that has come to my attention: An old farmer in my State had one son who volunteered and went to the Mexican border. His neighbor, right across the fence from him, had four sons, and none of them went. Now, this young man has been called out a second time, and his father wrote me a letter saying that he hardly thought it was fair that a man should go out and fight again when his neighbors, right across the fence, were laughing at him and saying that they would not be caught in any such fix as that.

Mr. McKELLAR. That case is not in point, for this reason: Under this bill we have the right to exempt that young man, whether he is a volunteer or whether he is a conscript. It is

immaterial. The Government does not have to take him because he volunteers. It has a right to exempt him. With all due respect, I do not think the illustration cited is a case in point at all.

I now come to what has been called the democracy of the service. If this partial law, by which the burden of this war is placed primarily upon 500,000 boys—one two-hundredth of our population—if that is democracy of service for one's country, then I am utterly unable to understand the term. Is that universal service? Is there any universal service about that? Why, it is the narrowest limit of service that can be effectively established. It is putting the burden of war on the smallest number of people possible, and a large part of this small class are not even citizens.

But my distinguished and very greatly beloved friend, a man for whom I have the warmest affection, and I think we all have, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], on yesterday made this argument: He said that he objected to the volunteer system because it required the best blood to go forward; that we got the flower of our country under a volunteer system, whereas under this system we would get slackers and all. Let us see what we get under this system. Let us see whether this contention is correct.

We first take the 6,000,000 of boys between 19 and 25. That is a pretty fair sample of our male population, is it not? They are pretty carefully selected. You could not have gotten 6,000,000 better men, physically, morally, and in every other way, in a blood way, as well as in every other way, than by such a process. But does it stop there? Not at all. You first say: "We will not take any of that 6,000,000 who are physically unfit," and you have the doctors to examine them all over the country. They have to pass a physical examination; and under the experience of the War Department, when you make that examination, you eliminate 2,500,000 of them, and you reduce the available number down to 3,500,000 under this system—this partial system. Then, when you do that, you come along and get the morally deficient, and you get those whose religious views will not let them make good soldiers, and you get those of certain exempted classes, and you exempt all those. You narrow it down to 3,000,000, according to the best view. And then what do you do? Why, you take those 3,000,000 of the very flower of our country, and you just select the best one man out of every six!

Now, I may not know a thing in the world about reasoning; I may not know anything in the world about getting the best blood; but, unless I am fearfully mistaken, I do not believe a better plan could be devised to get the very best blood in our country to go forward in the first draft. I say that this talk about volunteers bringing forth the best blood of our country as a sacrifice, while it may be partly true, is not one-half as true as the process of getting the best blood that is used in this bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just one word, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. While we are talking about universal military service, while these 3,000,000 young men are put into the service, there are 19,000,000 of military age who entirely escape.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have that under a subsequent subdivision of what I have to say. I will refer to it now. We have at least 21,000,000—

Mr. GALLINGER. Twenty-two.

Mr. McKELLAR. Twenty-one millions of men, and maybe twenty-two, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire says, of military age in this country; and I have heard for three years the argument of the militarists in every newspaper, on every stump, and in every place that what this country needs is universality of both training and service. They say that the burden of defending the country ought to be put on the same basis as taxation; that it ought to be applied to all alike. It is a very persuasive argument, I will say, and it has a great deal of force. I am not prepared to say that it is not all right; but does this bill give it? Instead of putting the burden on 21,000,000 men, it puts it in the first instance on 500,000 and in the second instance on another 500,000 boys.

It is easy enough for men to say: "Let George do it. If anybody is going to get killed, let Bill be killed." It is a popular argument. It appeals to the many. It is evidently appealing to all men over 25 years of age in this country. They are using a good deal of persuasion all over the country to limit it; but is that right? Why, this age limit ought to be changed in any event. I think amendments have been offered here to change it; and, by the way, I will refer to that phase of the matter right now.

We are asked to leave the traditions and the history of the Anglo-Saxon race for the first time since William the Conqueror went to England in 1066 in the matter of the formation of an army, and we are asked to pattern after the military despotisms of Germany and of Russia and of Austria; and even such despotisms as those never took the services of a boy 19 years of age.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. I have the figures here that were given me awhile ago. Germany, which we are asked to follow, fixes the minimum age at 20 years, and a number of the countries fix it at 21. I have no doubt the Senator has the same figures, and I will read them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was going to call the Senator's attention—

Mr. McKELLAR. I have those figures right here, I think; and, so that the Senate may be absolutely certain about it, I will give them.

In Germany, universal and conscription, actual service begins at 20; Austria-Hungary, 21; Turkey, 20; Roumania, 21; Bulgaria, 20; Serbia, 21; Sweden, 20; Norway, 28; Denmark, 21; England, volunteers much younger; France, compulsory, begins at 20; Russia, universal and compulsory, begins at 20; Italy begins at 20; Japan at 20; Brazil at 21; Portugal at 20; Greece at 21; Switzerland at 21; Chile at 21; and Argentina at 20. Those are the figures as taken from the records. Now, are they correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was not questioning those figures. I wanted to call attention to another matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was referring to the accuracy of the figures.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not to those figures; no. If this law violates the Anglo-Saxon tradition and the tradition of our own people, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his own State has done the same thing. In 1909 a law was passed in Tennessee providing that all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45 who were residents of the State should constitute the militia, making certain exemptions, and section 6 of the same act subjects them to the draft.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct about Tennessee. I am proud of the fact that we permit boys to enlist by volunteering at the age of 18, and I think that is all right. I have no fault to find with it, but I am speaking about the policy here. We older men are undertaking to put the burden of this war on boys who are not old enough to make a contract, who are not citizens. I do not believe in it. I may be wrong. I have heard from but one boy in all this controversy under 23 years of age, and he said that he thought it was wrong. Of course, an individual opinion does not make any difference.

Now, it is remarkable what peculiar views we have about this bill. I think most people have an idea that we are passing on the question of universal service. I have even heard some Senators, in an unguarded moment, say that this was the principle of universal service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption, I want to say that the bulk of the telegrams which I have received, both for and against this measure, assume that this is a bill for universal service, when as a matter of fact it is not.

Mr. McKELLAR. A great many of the telegrams that I have seen have urged me to vote for the General Staff universal-service plan; a great many other telegrams have urged me to vote for the Chamberlain military training bill, showing that because of the advertisements and propaganda that have gone out there is well entrenched in the public mind back home the idea that we are passing upon a democratic measure for universal service for the defense of the country, when as a matter of fact, when you examine the provisions of this bill without the amendment that I have offered, you see that it is the most partial and undemocratic kind of a measure, and does not provide for universal training or service at all.

Mr. President, there is one other matter that I want to discuss right here. It is strange what kind of views we have. Just a few days ago I saw in a newspaper published in Washington a terrific onslaught upon certain Members of the House because those Members of the House favored putting an amendment for volunteers on this bill, and I think the very day after that onslaught was made that very paper—the editor of which is no doubt one of the ablest men we have in this city, whose editorials I always enjoy—turns deliberately around and makes one of the best arguments for the volunteer provision in this amendment that I have seen submitted by anyone, and I am going to weary the Senate for just a few moments by reading

an editorial in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 22, 1917. The article is entitled—

"THE ROOSEVELT VOLUNTEERS."

Officers in the War Department are said to be opposed to granting permission to Col. Theodore Roosevelt to raise a division of volunteers for early service in France, because they think it would be inconsistent with the plan for raising a regular army by selective draft.

If this objection were valid, Col. Roosevelt's patriotic offer should be declined.

But where is there any inconsistency? Where would the two plans conflict, and how?

Col. Roosevelt proposes to raise a division of volunteers, to be commanded by Regular Army officers. He proposes to accept men above the age of 25, who would not be subject to draft.

The President's plan for selective draft would not be affected in the slightest degree by raising a division of volunteers. Is it argued that young men who could not get into the Roosevelt division would lose heart? They would be subject to draft just the same. Is it suggested that young men drafted would suffer under the imputation that they had not volunteered? The answer is that they could not volunteer. They would be upon exactly the same footing as other men of their age, rich and poor. Is objection made because the volunteer division would go forward first and gain all the credit? There will be credit enough for all who go to the front. The emergency calls for the American flag at the front. Is it to be kept at home because somebody would get credit for taking it to the battle line? The man who raises this objection should search his heart and ask himself if he is not willing to sacrifice his country's welfare to his own desire for first honors.

The law providing for universal selective draft could not cast any imputation upon any man. It would not prevent any men above 25 from volunteering in the first expeditionary force, nor cast doubt upon the patriotism of those who did not volunteer. The Roosevelt division would be created to meet an emergency. The army raised by selective draft would go forward when ready. Neither could replace the other, and neither could possibly interfere with the other.

There is work to be done for all Americans. If 100,000 men above 25, already familiar with arms and drill, are ready to fall in for service in France, why hold them back? Is the War Department unable to provide for 100,000 men now? It can be given means and the task of outfitting 100,000 men will furnish valuable experience to be applied to the bigger task later on.

Every one of Col. Roosevelt's division would be a picked man, capable of rendering invaluable service to the inexperienced men who will be raised by selective draft. Thousands of them could be brought back after active service at the front to train the recruits according to the actual needs of modern war. Just as the American volunteers now at the front could be of the greatest service in training men here, so the Roosevelt division would be available.

In the meantime the American flag would have been planted in France, never to withdraw while German armies were on French soil. The improvised forces would in due time give way to the Regular Army of the United States, which would carry the flag to victory.

If that argument is applicable to 100,000 men, why is it not applicable to 500,000 men? Why single out one and say, "You can go to the front, as your fathers have," and deny the privilege to the thousands and the hundreds of thousands of other men in this country who want to go and fight for their country?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator from Tennessee favor Col. Roosevelt raising a division if he wishes to?

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, I do not object to any man's raising a division. I think that any man who wants to raise a division in this country ought to have the right to do it. I believe in the freemen of this country doing the fighting. I do not believe that we ought to resort to a partial system of conscription.

And that brings me to this point in what I have to say: I have felt greatly embarrassed in the position that I have taken here. I was educated in a military school, served in every position from private to captain, graduated as one of the captains of a company, and served with the National Guard for some years. I have been on the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I have taken a more or less active interest in the military affairs of our country. I started what I had to say awhile ago with the statement that I abhor militarism. I believe in a democratic army. I believe in a volunteer army, and always have believed in it. I inherited that belief. Likely you have. I still believe in it. I have no doubt you do. I believed in it three years ago when the Congress, of which I was then a Member, passed the volunteer bill. We thought it accorded with American history and traditions and American honor and American right. We believed it. I have not changed my mind. I still am of that opinion; and with that history I regret more than I can say that I have to differ with some of my friends.

Mr. President, there is no man in this country whom I admire more than I do Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States. I think he is the greatest man on the face of the earth to-day. I believe in him. He is my friend and I am his friend. I regret to differ with any plan that he has endorsed. But at the same time, with such knowledge as I have of the facts, I can not do else in this Chamber than to vote the way I believe is right. When I first came to Congress, and began to cast my votes on various questions, I adopted the policy of trying to find out what was the moral side, what was the right side, of every question upon which I was called on to vote; and as long as I have served in Congress I have never yet

voted except in accordance with what I believed to be right, and, so help me God, I never shall vote in any other way. I regret more than I can say that I differ, even in this detail, with the leader of my party; but I would not be a man if I did aught else than follow my mature conviction of what is right and vote for the volunteer system, because I believe that is right.

Mr. President, the very term of conscription in this country of free men is offensive, and every man to whom it has been applied in the history of this Republic has been looked down upon with contempt by his fellow men. The reason for this is because we have only conscripted men when we could not get volunteers.

Now, in the very beginning of the war for us to set aside the volunteer system of raising an army, the system of free men, the system which gives us our best soldiers, the system which gives us the most courageous soldiers is set aside in one act, and instead of that system we are to have a system of exclusive conscription. In the eyes of all men it will be said that the only reason that this proud Republic resorted to conscription in the beginning was because we had so degenerated that we did not have enough patriotic men to volunteer to fight their country's battles. That can be the only excuse offered for such a system in the beginning of a war. I have no sympathy for such a contention. I believe that the Americans of to-day are just as courageous as any men in the history of this Republic. I believe that they would win fame for their country and their flag, and I for one am opposed to applying that hated term of conscript to them until all other methods have failed.

Mr. President, I am from a State that is known in the sisterhood of States as the Volunteer State of this Republic. She won that name by the willingness of her sons to offer their services in war as a sacrifice for our common country. In the Revolutionary War it was John Sevier and Tennesseans who turned the tide at Kings Mountain, and gave to this Republic a local habitation and name forever. In the War of 1812 her sons distinguished themselves on every field, but it was left to that immortal hero, not only of Tennessee history but of the history of the world, Andrew Jackson, who won a name and fame for the Volunteer State, and the dearest hope of my heart is that as the Volunteer State we will be known as long as the Republic of America is known to the world. In the Civil War, Mr. President, Tennessee furnished more troops in proportion to her citizens to both armies than perhaps any other State in the Union. Her sons lived up, whether they were on the one side or the other, to the proud distinction of history as the Volunteer State of the United States.

In the Spanish-American War again her sons were enrolled in the first call for volunteers and bore themselves proudly and courageously through that conflict. And now, Mr. President, when the country is threatened again the sons of this proud Commonwealth have already enlisted in the National Guard in greater numbers than the law requires, and tendered organizations have already been rejected. The people of that State come again and ask the American Congress to let their sons fight as volunteers for our common country and our common flag. Are you going to deny these sons that right? Are you going to say to them, "Your history is a mockery and your name a symbol of dishonor"? Are you going to say to them, "You will no longer be called volunteers according to the history and traditions of your fathers, and the proud name your forefathers earned on many battle fields is to be wiped out forever"? Are you going to say to them, "Heretofore you have been called volunteers, but hereafter your name will be conscript"? God forbid, Mr. President, that any such law will ever be passed by this Congress!

Mr. President, we have always believed in this country that all just government came through the consent of the governed; that is the principle of the volunteer plan of raising an army. We are asked to disregard that plan and to substitute what in its place? The answer is force. No longer will a man in this country have a right to fight for his country. He will be forced to fight for his country provided he happens to be within a certain age. Instead of universal service we will have partial service; instead of laying the burdens of defense upon all men of military age, we are laying it upon an insignificant portion that comes between the ages of 19 and 25. Instead of obligation of all men to defend their country we are asked to put that obligation upon less than 6 per cent of our population, and this 6 per cent is composed of young boys of our country. It may be right, Mr. President, but I for one am unable to see the justice of the scheme. It will be a sad day for free America when we substitute force for patriotism.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering the many able arguments made by the Senator from

Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], but simply for the purpose of reading a letter from the Secretary of War in order to clarify the atmosphere relative to his position and the position of the General Staff as to the number of volunteers that will be permitted under the present bill.

We are facing a great crisis, the greatest, I believe, in the history of this Government, and what we are all attempting to do is to come to a fair understanding as to what it is best to do for our country at this time.

The Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, worked earnestly in preparing the bill that is now before the Senate and had several hearings. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee that held public hearings. During the subcommittee hearings all the statements were taken down by a stenographer, but unfortunately the day the Secretary of War appeared before us we did not have the statements of the Secretary and those who accompanied him taken down by a stenographer. For that reason there has arisen a misunderstanding as to what was said.

I therefore, on the 20th instant, addressed a letter to the Secretary of War asking him what present organizations in the different States will be permitted to be completed and what the status of the men will be who enlist in the National Guard. In answer to my letter he addressed the following communication to me, which I hope I may be permitted to read without interruption so as to have it properly in the Record, and then we can discuss any features of the same that Senators feel should be discussed. I now read the letter from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 20, 1917.

HON. JAMES H. BRADY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of April 20, 1917, addressed to Gen. Crowder on the subject of the number of men that would be permitted to volunteer, assuming that the pending Senate bill for raising additional forces has been enacted into law, I take great pleasure in furnishing you the information requested.

In a letter dated April 15, 1917, to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, on this same subject, I wrote as follows:

"A request was made by the committee during my recent hearing to have inserted in the record a summary of the number of places the draft of a bill submitted by the War Department provided for individual voluntary enlistments. The summary given below is furnished in compliance with that request. The numbers given refer to the Army only, of course, and do not take into consideration the outlet for voluntary enlistments for the Navy and Marine Corps, which forces are to rely entirely on voluntary enlistments.

Authorized strength of Regular Army, all increments included, exclusive of Philippine Scouts	293, 000
Present strength	131, 481

Available for voluntary enlistments	161, 519
-------------------------------------	----------

War strength of National Guard organizations now existing	329, 954
Present actual strength	123, 605

Available for voluntary enlistments	206, 349
-------------------------------------	----------

Needed to raise existing units of the National Guard to war strength and the Regular Army with all increments added to war strength	367, 868
---	----------

The bill provides that a training cadre may be transferred from those two forces to train the additional forces. The War College Division recommends as a minimum cadre for training a force of 500,000 men in time of peace 148,850 men, and this would add that number of places for voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army and National Guard when this training cadre was taken for the first additional force of 500,000 men.

The law as drafted and construed by the Judge Advocate General before your committee would permit recruit training units for the Regular Army and National Guard to be maintained by voluntary recruiting. The minimum strength of such recruit training units would approximate one-third the strength of the units to which they would supply losses, or give a total strength of recruit training units for the Regular Army of approximately 98,000 men and 110,000 for existing units of the National Guard, or a total number of volunteers in the recruit training units of 208,000 men.

The bill further provides that special and technical troops may be raised by volunteer or compulsory methods. If these be raised by the volunteer system, it would add to the total number given above for voluntary enlistments, but as the number can not now be definitely determined they are omitted.

SUMMARY.

Additional numbers that may be filled by voluntary enlistments under War Department plan:

Units of the Regular Army	161, 519
Units of the National Guard	206, 349
First training cadre	148, 850
Recruit training units for existing National Guard	110, 000
Recruit training units for the Regular Army	98, 000

Total	724, 718
-------	----------

The figures quoted above answer the question asked in your letter in regard to the additional number volunteering in the Regular Army and the additional number volunteering in existing organizations of the National Guard. The bill makes no provision for volunteer except as discussed above in any other of the authorized forces.

In reply to your fourth question "as to just what present organizations in the different States will be permitted to be completed and what

the status of the men will be who enlist in the National Guard," I would say it is the intention of the War Department to raise existing organizations of the National Guard to peace strength of the Regular Army before permitting the organization of new units of that force. In order to complete the elements now lacking in the existing 12 divisions of the National Guard, the War Department will prescribe of what the new units shall consist; that is, whether they shall be Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, etc. A memorandum explaining this matter in detail, prepared in the Militia Division, is attached hereto.

The status of new men who have enlisted in the National Guard since the declaration of war will be identical with those of such men who have enlisted in the Regular Army and those selected for the additional forces to be provided by the act now under consideration; that is, they will be discharged at the expiration of the existing emergency.

Trusting that the information given above answers completely your letter of April 20, I am,

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. President, it seems to me this letter gives us all the information we need relative to the number of men that will be permitted to volunteer under the present plan of the General Staff and the administration, and should enable us to discuss the present bill with a better understanding as to what the language of the same means, and what the intent and purposes of the War Department are.

We are to-day all aiming for the same end. I hope to see a law enacted that will be just as nearly as possible satisfactory to every Member of this body. But we must realize that we are at war. The time for talking and tears has passed. The time for action is here. While we may differ as to the manner and the method, I do not believe there is a Member of this body who differs as to what our purpose is, and that is to win the awful struggle that we have entered into.

We are necessarily compelled to raise a large army. The only question that we are discussing to-day is, How shall we raise it? What is it, Senators, that we are disagreeing upon? There was not a dissenting vote on the passage of the bill giving \$7,000,000,000 as a war fund. We were all agreed upon that. The Senator who just preceded me, an honest man, an able man, an honored Member of this body whom we are glad to receive here, honestly differs from me as to the manner and method in which this army should be raised. But what are our differences?

I want to raise an army of 1,200,000 men as our Commander in Chief and the General Staff recommends it should be raised. I am not going to set my opinion against the opinion of the War College of this country, against the opinion of all the generals of our Army, and against the opinion of the man whom the Senator just said, in his judgment, was the greatest man on earth. I may not agree with him so fully as to all that, but I do agree with him when he says it is right and proper to follow him just as far as we can in this emergency.

As I said before, what are the differences? Take the bill section by section and we find that we agree on practically everything until we come to the method of raising the Army. I am just as much in favor of the rights of man and of democracy as any human being can be. I believe that the chance of every man in this country should be equal, and in attempting to secure that condition I believe we can reach the matter of equality in no fairer way than has been suggested by the administration and approved and adopted by the Committee on Military Affairs in recommending this measure.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] has made an eloquent plea to permit the brave men of Tennessee to volunteer. They are given that privilege under this bill. The history of the brave men of Tennessee is one of which not only Tennessee but the entire Nation may well be proud; but under this bill we do not intend to deprive them of the opportunity to volunteer. What army do they want to join? Under this bill they can volunteer and enlist in the Regular Army or in the National Guard. What the General Staff is trying to do, and what the President is trying to do, is to get a central control, simply because the war in Europe, which has cost billions and billions of dollars and millions and millions of lives, has taught lessons that we should heed. Therefore, Senators, let me ask you why the men of Tennessee can not volunteer under the bill as reported by the committee. The Secretary of War tells us in this letter that in units of the Regular Army there is opportunity for 161,519 men to volunteer. That is the same Army that fought the battles of the War of Independence, the same Army that won the War of 1812, in which Jackson fought, and the same Army that went to Mexico. Our citizens have the opportunity to volunteer in that Army; but, if they do not want to do that, there is an opportunity for 206,349 men to enlist in the National Guard. If they prefer to organize a home guard and have their own regiments and have them turned over by the State to the Nation as units, they can volunteer in such organizations, and their term of service will only be for the war, just for this emergency, for the length of time that they are needed to defend their country. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that every opportunity is given to every American citizen to volunteer.

The question has been raised as to the age limit. This body must decide the age limit. The bill has been framed to cover certain ages, which the committee and the General Staff thought were right. If it is proper to raise the age limit from 25 to 35, as has been suggested, an amendment may be proposed to accomplish that purpose.

With this evidence before us as to what the Secretary of War has said and as to what the intent of the administration and the General Staff is, all these questions may be easily and thoroughly understood.

I hope that I may so conduct myself in the discussion of this matter that those who disagree with me will understand that I appreciate and know and feel that the difference between us is only a difference of opinion and not of purpose. It is my hope, as I have heretofore said, that we may counsel together, agree upon the sections of this bill that we can agree upon, and then, when we come to one or two subjects about which there may be difference of opinion, let us discuss them for a reasonable length of time, vote upon them, and then send the bill to the President to be signed, so that we may let Germany and the world know that America is in this war with a determined purpose to fight to a finish. By doing that we will do more for democracy and our country than in any other way. I hope we will finish the discussion at as early a date as possible, enact this measure into law, and then proceed to the consideration of other necessary business that must be transacted in order to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question. Does the bill limit the volunteers who may be raised under the provisions of the bill to the same age as in the case of those who are to be conscripted, to wit, between 19 and 25?

Mr. BRADY. A man can volunteer in any of the branches of the service to which I have referred between the ages of 18 and 45.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am glad to hear that. I thought from a remark that the Senator made that he was of the other opinion. Has the Senator in mind the total number who could volunteer under the terms of this bill? As he read from the Secretary's letter it was in fragments, the numbers being stated as to different organizations. I do not know whether the Senator has added the various numbers together.

Mr. BRADY. The total number who can volunteer under the proposed plan is 724,718.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And they can volunteer at any age up to as high as 45 years?

Mr. BRADY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wish to submit a proposed amendment to the pending bill raising the age limit. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that action will be taken.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask leave to offer an amendment to the pending bill, to be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I offer an amendment to the pending military bill, and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That action will be taken.

ODD FELLOWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration—

Mr. FLETCHER. Before the Senator makes that motion I will ask him to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably the bill (S. 1800) to amend an act approved June 29, 1906, and entitled "An act to authorize the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia to sell, hold, and convey certain real estate." It is a unanimous report from the committee, and has reference to the Grand Lodge of Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia, which lodge is about to engage in constructing a new building. Everything is hung up pending an amendment of their charter. This amendment will authorize them to encumber the present site for the purpose of erecting a new building or to put a new building on another site and sell the present site. It will only take a few moments to pass the bill, and I think it ought to be done.

Mr. BRADY. Does the bill involve the expenditure of any amount of money from the Treasury?

Mr. FLETCHER. It involves the expenditure of no public money. It involves simply the power of the lodge to place a trust upon the property sufficient to put up a building.

Mr. BRADY. Before giving my consent to the passage of the bill I should like to have it read.

Mr. FLETCHER. It pertains to the lodge here in Washington. It simply amends the law relating to the grand lodge which heretofore has been passed by Congress. There is some question raised as to their power to place a trust on property that they might acquire in exchange for their present property.

Mr. BRADY. It is a private matter?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is entirely private, and relates to the local lodge of Odd Fellows in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It simply proposes to make a change in the charter of the local organization.

Mr. BRADY. Then I see no reason why the bill should not pass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRANDEGEE and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was merely going to ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The bill of the Senator from Florida can be passed by unanimous consent without laying aside the unfinished business temporarily.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to authorize the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia to sell, hold, and convey certain real estate," be amended to read as follows:

"That the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia, a corporation created under and by virtue of an act of Congress approved June 12, 1860, be, and hereby is, authorized to sell and convey for, or to borrow and secure by deed of trust thereon, such sum or sums as may be satisfactory to the several organizations hereinafter named as owners, those parcels of ground in the city of Washington, D. C., known and designated on the plat of said city as lot No. 11 and part of lot No. 10 in square No. 457, together with the buildings thereon known as Odd Fellows' Hall, the title to which property is now held in trust by the said corporation for the following organizations, owners thereof, namely: The Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia; Columbian Encampment, No. 1, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; Central Lodge, No. 1, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; Washington Lodge, No. 6, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; Columbia Lodge, No. 10, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; Beacon Lodge, No. 15, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; Excelsior Lodge, No. 17, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; and Eastern Lodge, No. 7, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, the consent of each of said several organizations being evidenced by a written instrument bearing the seal and the signature of its executive officers; the proceeds of said sale or loan may be applied to the payment and liquidation of any debt on said property or toward the purchase of other ground and the erection thereon of a building or buildings for like purposes as those for which the above-described property has been held, or to the erection of a new building, or to repairing or rebuilding on the ground now held, said property to be held in trust for said above-mentioned organizations according to their respective interests therein, and for such other organizations of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows as may hereafter contribute to the cost of such property, according to the amount respectively contributed by each: *Provided,* That any purchaser or purchasers of such property shall not be required to see to the proper application of the money paid therefor.

"SEC. 2. That the said corporation shall be authorized and capable of taking and holding real and personal property in trust for said organizations to any value not exceeding the sum of \$1,000,000, and shall have full power and authority, upon a resolution or resolutions of each of said beneficiary organizations, to, from time to time, encumber any ground and the improvements thereon held in trust for said organizations, or any part thereof, in such manner, for such purpose, and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by said resolution or resolutions."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask that the following petition from citizens of Seattle, Wash., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Unreservedly we ally ourselves with that fundamental democracy toward which all mankind strives, and of which the English-speaking people are happily the chief exponents, as against the medieval autocracy by which the Imperial German Government temporarily dominates its own people and plunges the world into armed conflict.

We favor conducting this war with the utmost of resolution and expedition and pledge thereto, so far as we may, the hearty cooperation

of our entire citizenship. We recognize the great sacrifice of personal interests cheerfully accepted by the men of our Army and Navy and favor making the most perfect possible provision for their success, for their safety, and for their well-being. To that end we purpose doing, in our several capacities, whatever may be possible to us. We will refrain from profiting by the sacrifice of our neighbors and favor making that practice generally impossible by limiting permissible profits on the sale of munitions of war and necessities for life. We also favor conducting this war on a cash basis, so far as may be done, in order to avoid burdening our posterity with debt for a philanthropic endeavor, the cost of which our Nation can meet from day to day by eliminating wasteful and useless private expenditures, by the joint application of our united labors to useful purposes, by putting our vacant lands to productive uses, and by directing into the Public Treasury all private incomes over and above reasonable requirements for living expenses.

In furtherance thereof we respectfully urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of appropriate laws limiting the rate of permissible profits in certain cases, laying a special war tax of 3 per cent on personal income above \$5,000 per annum, and increasing that rate with respect to larger sums, so that no person may spend for himself during the war a larger sum than the salary of the President of the United States, namely, \$75,000 per annum, or thereabouts.

We further request the President and Congress to enact the necessary legislation to create a food commission for the purpose of eliminating waste and preventing speculation, and we make the following recommendations:

No. 1. That the commission make an immediate survey of all the food resources now on hand in the United States.

No. 2. That the commission commandeer the storage warehouses and that the storage of food be controlled by the commission.

No. 3. That the price of all foodstuffs be fixed by the commission.

No. 4. That the commission encourage the planting of crops and the raising of cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry in every possible way.

No. 5. That the commission act as the middleman and distributors of food from the producer to the retailer, without profit to the commission, until the war closes.

The foregoing petition was unanimously indorsed by a large mass meeting held April 12, 1917, at the Tivoli Theater, Seattle, Wash., at the call of the Commonwealth Club, and the undersigned committee was instructed by said mass meeting to immediately forward the same to Congress.

OTTO A. CASE, Chairman.
MRS. GEORGE A. SMITH.
F. E. RAWLINGS.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented 25 telegrams from citizens and firms in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against volunteer enlistment, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented 15 telegrams from citizens and firms in the State of Michigan, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Albion, Mich., praying that the proposed revenue law take up substantially all of the special war profits, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Petoskey and Battle Creek, in the State of Michigan, pledging support to the President and praying for compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Greenwich, Conn., praying for compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Crittenden, Benham Grain Co., G. E. Johnston & Co., H. G. Shepard Sons Co., F. Mansfield & Sons Co., and of the congregation of the East Pearl Street Methodist Episcopal Church, all of New Haven, in the State of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Hartford County, Conn., praying for the adoption of an efficiency amendment to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the New Hampshire State Pharmaceutical Association, remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Antrim, Hanover, Concord, and Center Harbor; of the New Hampshire Antisaloon League; and of the Union Congregation of Unitarian and Congregational Churches of Walpole, all in the State of New Hampshire; and of Henry G. Ives and the W. H. McElwain Co., of Boston, Mass., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Douglas, Wyo., praying for national prohibition and for the protection of military camps from vice, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sheridan (Wyo.) Trades and Labor Assembly, praying for an investigation of the price of foodstuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Federation, of Pasadena, Cal., praying for

national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the city council of Revere, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation for the Federal control of food and fuel, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. NELSON. I present a petition from citizens of Stearns County, Minn., pledging support to the country, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAUK CENTER, MINN., April 20, 1917.

Senator KNUTE NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As loyal and patriotic citizens of Stearns County, in mass meeting assembled, a thousand strong, we pledge our services to the Nation's cause to the extent of our lives and fortunes.

We offer our services to do all in our power to help in the production of food and the cultivation of the soil that none may suffer for the lack of proper food. We offer to do all we can to help build up an army of workers who will enlist for the cause of democracy.

We offer this resolution in order that a more effective force may be gathered to help strengthen the Government in using its resources to bring the war to a speedy and successful close.

We offer this message to you that you may act immediately and crush once and for all time the great monster and foe of human liberty and freedom. We appreciate such men as you and trust you will live many years to serve as a representative of our Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

A. J. DUBEAN,
Mayor of Sauk Center, Minn.
JOHN N. MCGIBBON,
President Board of Education.
M. D. AYGAHN,
Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Dubois, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a selective draft system, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Portage, Homer City, and Oakmont; of the congregation of the Christ Methodist Episcopal Church, of West Philadelphia; of the Presbytery of Butler; and of the congregation of the Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition during the period of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLT presented the petition of Augustus T. Swift and 32 other citizens of Rhode Island, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Olneyville, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the saving of daylight, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of the faculty and students of the University of Texas, Austin, Tex., praying for the raising of an army by selective draft, based upon the principle of universal liability to military service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 292 citizens of Cisco; of sundry citizens of Celina; of 300 citizens of Odem; of 35 citizens of Irene; of sundry citizens of Electra, Hartley, and Carthage; of the congregations of the Baptist and Methodist Churches of Slaton, Woodland Heights, Houston, and Mullen; of the Business Men's Bible Class of the First Baptist Church of Temple; of the congregations of the First Baptist Church of McKinney, the Baptist Church of Arlington, the First Baptist Church of Richland, the First Christian Church of Paris; of the Pastors' Association, the presidents of Simmons College and Christian College of Abilene; and of sundry churches of Douglassville and Carleton, all in the State of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of 53 citizens of Galveston; of sundry citizens of Houston; of the Farmers' Institute of Westover; of the Williamson County Farmers and Citizens' Institute; and of H. O. Nelson & Co., of Houston, all in the State of Texas, praying for selective conscription, and indorsing the administration's war policies, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of six citizens of Greenville, Tex., praying for the passage of the House volunteer army bill, and remonstrating against the Senate bill, favoring the age limit from 21 to 40, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Susie M. Gilbert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2080) granting an increase of pension to John Reiman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2081) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Alger; and

A bill (S. 2082) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Newhall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 2084) granting a pension to William F. Rogers (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2085) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Penland (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2086) for the relief of Alvin Harder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2087) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2088) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto; to the Committee on Public Lands.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 382) providing for a system of national defense based upon universal liability to military training and service, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., Tuesday, April 24, 1917) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 23), 1917.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Thomas M. Robins, Corps of Engineers, to be major from April 14, 1917, vice Maj. Arthur Williams, retired from active service April 13, 1917.

First Lieut. Gordon R. Young, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from April 14, 1917, vice Capt. Thomas M. Robins, promoted.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. James L. Collins, Eleventh Cavalry, to be captain from March 31, 1917, vice Capt. Joseph C. King, unassigned, placed on detached officers' list.

First Lieut. William C. McChord, Cavalry, detached officers' list, to be captain from March 31, 1917, vice Capt. George L. Converse, jr., Fourth Cavalry, placed on detached officers' list.

First Lieut. William R. Henry, Cavalry, detached officers' list, to be captain from March 31, 1917, vice Capt. Alexander H. Jones, unassigned, placed on detached officers' list.

First Lieut. George F. Patten, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from March 31, 1917, vice Capt. Murray B. Rush, unassigned, placed on detached officers' list.

First Lieut. Robert M. Cheney, Fifth Cavalry, to be captain from April 9, 1917, vice Capt. Rodman Butler, Eighth Cavalry, placed on detached officers' list.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

First Lieut. John T. Kennedy, Seventh Field Artillery, to be captain from February 26, 1917, vice Capt. George M. Apple, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Thomas J. Johnson, Second Field Artillery, to be captain from February 27, 1917, vice Capt. Phillip W. Booker, Fifth Field Artillery, placed on detached officers' list.

First Lieut. Leo J. Ahern, First Field Artillery, to be captain from March 21, 1917, vice Capt. Edgar H. Yule, Sixth Field Artillery, promoted.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Second Lieut. Ernest L. Osborne, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from April 14, 1917, vice First Lieut. Gordon R. Young, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 23), 1917.

CONSULS.

CLASS 6.

Wesley Frost to be a consul of class 6.

CLASS 7.

Arthur C. Frost to be a consul of class 7.

Paul H. Foster to be a consul of class 7.

CLASS 8.

Albro L. Burnell to be a consul of class 8.

James H. Goodier to be a consul of class 8.

O. Gaylord Marsh to be a consul of class 8.

CLASS 9.

Ralph F. Chesbrough to be a consul of class 9.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

J. L. Camp to be United States attorney, western district of Texas.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

William J. McDonald to be United States marshal, northern district of Texas.

John H. Rogers to be United States marshal, western district of Texas.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Harlan P. Perrill,
Arthur J. Hepburn,
Cyrus R. Miller,
David F. Boyd,
Andrew T. Graham,
Zeno E. Briggs,
Clarence A. Abele,
Thomas L. Johnson,
Edward T. Constien,
Edgar B. Larimer,
Alfred W. Johnson, and
Walter M. Hunt.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Isaac C. Johnson, jr.,
Leigh M. Stewart,
Richard P. McCullough,
George V. Stewart,
Jonathan S. Dowell, jr.,
Nelson H. Goss,
Stanford C. Hooper,
William O. Spears,
Walter H. Lassing,
Ernest Durr, and
Harry E. Shoemaker.

Civil Engineer Luther E. Gregory, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with rank of commander.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners:

Henry W. Stratton, and
William Seyford.

Lieut. Commander Arthur Crenshaw to be a commander.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Clarence S. Kempff,
David C. Hanrahan,
Joseph K. Taussig,
William S. Miller, and
Charles E. Courtney.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Charles S. Kerrick,
Louis P. Davis,
Arthur W. Sears,
George C. Pegram, and
Harold G. Bowen.

Passed Asst. Surg. Wrey G. Farwell to be a surgeon.

Asst. Civil Engineer Ralph M. Warfield to be a civil engineer.

Lieut. Col. Thomas C. Treadwell to be colonel in the Marine Corps.

Lieut. Col. Albert S. McLemore to be assistant adjutant and inspector in the Marine Corps.

Maj. James T. Bootes to be lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps:

William H. Pritchett,
Edward A. Greene,
Raymond B. Sullivan,
Howard H. Kipp, and
Nelson P. Vulte.

First Lieut. Frederick A. Gardener to be a captain in the Marine Corps.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps:

Howard C. Judson,
John Potts,
Benjamin S. Berry,
Harry W. Weitzel,
Arthur J. White, and
Samuel P. Budd.

Second Lieut. William C. MacCrone to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Harry K. Pickett,
Maurice S. Berry,
Harold D. MacLachlan,
John B. Seabee,
Egbert T. Lloyd, and
Ethelbert Talbot.

Lieut. Commander Frank L. Pinney to be a commander.

Lieut. George M. Baum to be a lieutenant commander.

Civil Engineer Homer R. Stanford, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be a civil engineer in the Navy with rank of commander.

Boatswain Michael J. Wilkinson to be a chief boatswain.

Boatswain Emory F. Hosmer to be a chief boatswain.

Gunner Clyde Keene to be a chief gunner.

Machinist Albert A. Hooper to be a chief machinist.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Frank E. Williams, Noank.

ILLINOIS.

Alta A. Rose, Atwood.
Fannie B. S. Morrison, Tower Hill.
Benjamin S. Burr, Medora.
Ira J. Aull, Kincaid.
Albert H. Nafziger, Danvers.

IOWA.

Julia Connelly, Churdan.
R. I. Juneau, Valley Junction.
D. D. Marshall, Oakville.
Maurice Connolly, Dubuque.

MARYLAND.

Thomas E. Frantz, Cockeysville.
John D. Showell, Ocean City.
Leonard H. Gosnell, Woodbine.
Harry Nalley, Mount Rainier.
G. W. Etchison, Gaithersburg.
John T. Culver, Forest Glen.

MISSOURI.

John H. Bueter, Bowling Green.
J. E. Shepherd, Seneca.
Richard W. Tucker, Senath.

NEW JERSEY.

Louis Cressman, Bloomsbury.
Simon Cunningham, Pennsgrove (late Penns Grove).
W. A. Tripp, Millington.
Samuel Munyan, Gibbstown.

RHODE ISLAND.

Edward F. Carroll, Providence.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Alfred E. Swift, Brookings.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. Y. Hamilton, Fairview.
Arthur Jackson, Littleton.

WYOMING.

Guy U. Shoemaker, Laramie.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 23), 1917.

U. V. Whipple, of Cordele, Ga., to be United States district judge, southern district of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 24, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, let the light of Thy truth possess our minds, and the sweetness of Thy love come into our hearts, that we may love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with Thee this day, and at its close enjoy the peace and tranquillity of soul which comes through right living; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to know if it is proposed that the general debate shall continue throughout the day?

Mr. DENT. Just prior to the adjournment yesterday afternoon unanimous consent was obtained that the procedure to-day should be the same as yesterday, and that this whole day should be used for general debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 3545, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 45 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Kentucky begins, may we know how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has used 2 hours and 46 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] has used 2 hours and 50 minutes, so that the time used has been practically evenly divided. The gentleman from Kentucky will proceed.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not unmindful of the responsibility that rests upon me and upon every Member of the Congress of the United States in these trying hours. And I feel that each member of the committee and the House approaches this most important question with a full desire to do that which is best for the country. I, with the majority of the committee, have been assailed by militaristic bodies and organizations through a certain element of the press throughout the country as being opposed to giving the President of the United States the power and the authority for which he asks to conduct this war. That statement is untrue, and everyone familiar with the facts knows that it is untrue. I do not charge that that falsehood went from the press gallery of this House, nor do I believe that it did. In fact, some members of the press have admitted to me that their reports appeared in some of the papers which they represent entirely different to the way they wrote them. One newspaper man came from New York for the purpose of interviewing the members of the committee, and frankly admitted to me after he had done so that we had been grossly misrepresented. But, that same chain of newspapers that have been misrepresenting facts to the American people in this case have heretofore misrepresented and libeled Members of Congress with the result that their charges were disproven by the facts and discredited by the people in due time.

It is true that there are some points on which the committee has been unable to agree with the plan of the General Staff of the Army, notwithstanding the fact that the plan of the General Staff has the sanction of the President. In fact, there is not one single Member of the committee or the House, so far as I know, who is willing to accept the plan of the General Staff exactly as it came to us, because it contained some provisions

which were absolutely arbitrary and which, if enacted into law, would place unnecessary hardships upon the people, without adding to the efficiency of the Army. The committee therefore, by unanimous vote, eliminated or amended those provisions. One of those provisions, to which I shall refer later, would have subjected men to punishment in the Federal courts and confinement in jail for failure to register for draft, even though prevented from doing so by circumstances beyond their control. And your committee felt that it is the duty of Congress to protect the people against such indefensible hardships and injustices, and yet we have been criticized by some of the newspapers for doing so.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it is not popular in some sections or among some people for a United States Senator or Representative to even have an opinion of his own at this time, much less express it. But that does not change or alter the sworn duty of Members of Congress to their constituents and their country. It seems that some people have lost sight of the fact that the only guaranty of the perpetuity of democratic government is freedom of thought, freedom of expression, honesty of purpose, and majority rule on the part of the people and their representatives in the solution of our great national problems. Some people have also lost sight of the fact that the Constitution of the United States imposes certain duties upon the Congress, and imposes upon its Members an oath to faithfully perform those duties. Some of those duties prescribed by the Constitution read as follows:

Congress shall have power—
 1. To raise and support armies. * * *
 2. To provide and maintain a navy.
 3. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Yet in the face of that language contained in the Constitution of our country, the greatest document ever written, that document which constitutes the pillar upon which our Government rests, and which guarantees its existence, some people, in this good year of 1917, less than 130 years after the adoption of that Constitution, believe that Members of Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, those people who make up the Army, who fight the battles of their country and die for its rights and its liberties, are not supposed to express an opinion or proclaim a conviction as to who or what class of the people shall be called to perform those arduous and painful duties, and if they dare to do so they are attacked by the militaristic journals and societies of all the country; but that shall not deter me in the discharge of my duty to the masses of people, upon whose shoulders and hearts the burdens of this war will most heavily bear.

I realize the necessity of unanimity of action between the legislative and executive branches of the Government at this time, and I and several other members of the committee have devoted several days to an effort to bring about absolute unanimity. We have all been willing to yield opinions and make concessions, but the military authorities have been unwilling to make any concessions, even in matters which are immaterial to the efficiency of the Army but most vital to the people. The one glowing evidence of that fact is their persistent effort to build the Army out of boys under 21 years of age. The only reason they give, or that I have heard them give, is that boys of that age are more obedient than older people. No one disputes that children, as a rule, are more obedient than men; but this is a man's war, and, by the eternals, they shall never fight it with children if I can prevent it.

As I said a moment ago, we have all been anxious to bring about unanimity of action, and to effect that result have been willing to yield opinions. Speaking for myself, I am frank to say that regardless of my opinion that those desiring to volunteer should have an opportunity to do so, I offered before we reported the bill, because of my desire for unanimity of action as well as my willingness to yield opinion, to yield on that if the administration would yield on the minimum age limit and recommend that it be made 21 instead of 19. I made this proposition not alone in the interest of harmony but also because I believed that the question of keeping the burdens of this war off of the undeveloped youths of this country the more important of the two. But they refused to do so, which forced me to yield not only my opinion but my conviction on that vital question of the minimum age, or be classed as opposing the administration. And then I accepted the gage of battle and shall fight to the last ditch, utilizing every means at my command, both in the House and in conference, to keep the burdens of this war off the shoulders of the undeveloped youth of this country, who have a right to develop to manhood under normal conditions and should be protected in that right. The question as to whether the Army shall be made and the battles fought

by the mature men of the country or the immature youths is not a military but a civil question, yea, a humane question. On matters strictly military I am willing to yield my opinions to the opinions of our military experts, especially in this crisis. But on questions which are not military in character but which affect the basic principles of the Republic and the fundamental principles of humanity and Christianity I refuse to turn over my brain, my heart, my conscience, and my soul to the military experts of this or any other nation on earth. [Applause.]

I favor the volunteer system because I believe it in keeping with the ideals of a free people, and, further, because I believe that an army can be raised more quickly by voluntary enlistment and that it will be a more effective army than a conscripted army. I shall therefore vote to retain the provision in the bill which authorizes the President to call for volunteers; but if that provision shall be stricken out by the majority vote of both Houses, thereby confining us exclusively to the draft system, then, in the name of justice and humanity, let us draft men, not children.

I shall not refer further to this subject at this time, but will return to it later.

I shall now come directly to the merits of the bill. As I have said, the Secretary of War presented to the committee a plan drawn by himself with the advice of the General Staff which had the sanction of the President of the United States, asking us to enlarge the Regular Army to full war strength; first, by voluntary enlistment; second, by conscription if the forces do not come by voluntary enlistment, and we give him that. Next he asks for an increase in the National Guard to full war strength, first by voluntary enlistment and second by conscription in the event that men do not enlist, and we give him that. Then he asks for authority to raise two additional increments of 500,000 men each, all by conscription, and stated that it would take about five months to put the machinery into operation for raising these increments by conscription. And the committee said: "We are willing, Mr. Secretary, that you shall have all the authority necessary to raise all the forces that you may need in the prosecution of this war regardless of the number that may be required. We will give you the draft system, for which you ask; not because a majority of the committee favors the draft system, for we do not except as a last resort; but we will provide for it in the bill so that it will be at the command of the President in the event he should need it, which we hope may not occur. We will also insert in the bill a provision authorizing the President to call for volunteers so that the men who want to volunteer may have an opportunity to do so while you are getting the draft system organized and perfected." We insert this provision in the bill in the hope that the President will exercise the authority which it will give him if it is permitted to remain in the bill, and confidently believe that if he does exercise that authority by giving the men of America an opportunity to volunteer it will never be necessary for him to exercise the power of conscription.

Because this provision was inserted in the bill, the committee has been attacked by the militaristic forces of the entire country; so let us attempt to see and understand why they are so opposed to it when it does not even make it mandatory upon the President to call for volunteers, but only gives him authority to do so. Ah, gentlemen, we had just as well be frank. We know and the military experts and their supporters know that we know why they are making such desperate efforts to have the volunteer provision stricken out of the bill. The reason is perfectly obvious, and I can not violate my conscience by remaining silent and saying by my silence that I indorse compulsory military service, both in war and in peace, as the military authorities desire it. If you will carefully follow the arguments of the representatives of the General Staff during this debate you will observe that they are working as hard to establish a compulsory policy for the future as they are to prepare for the raising of an army for the present war.

I have always favored adequate preparedness for national defense, and during my six years' service on the Military Committee I have worked hard for it. I favor widespread military training; but in peace times, at least, the young men of America should be permitted to choose their respective professions or pursuits, which is denied them under a compulsory military system, for the young man who is preparing to enter some permanent profession or pursuit knows not what hour the summons may come calling him to fill a vacancy in the Regular Army. And, on the other hand, the man who desires to enter the Army and make it his life's work is not permitted to do so unless his name happens to be drawn from the box, all of which is contrary to American ideals, and when this shall happen in the future I do not purpose to be placed in the attitude of having indorsed it. I therefore take advantage of this

opportunity to call attention to the effort that is being made toward permanent compulsory service for the future and to voice my protest against it.

There has been a fight in this country from the beginning of the Republic to fasten upon the country a compulsory military system for peace times as well as in war. Proposition after proposition leading to that has been put up to Congress from time to time under normal conditions, and it has been refused by the Congress, and the people have sustained Congress in its refusal.

But at this time we see in the actions of the General Staff the boldest of all efforts to fasten upon the country once and forever a compulsory military system, which the Government has not heretofore been willing to accept. When questioned as to why they refuse to encourage immediate enlistment for service at the front, they say it is "because it would be a recognition of the old volunteer system, which is broken down." I read in the papers the other day that when the question was asked why Col. Roosevelt was not commissioned to go to France, it was stated it was refused "because it would be a recognition of the old antiquated volunteer system."

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I would rather not yield at the present time, but I will later. But, my friends, all of you know or should know that the oldest and most antiquated military system known to civilization is the compulsory system. Go back 470 years before Christ to the wars between the Greeks and the Persians, the greatest battles known to civilized man, and what do we find there? We find an army of less than 110,000 Greeks on the one side, freemen, fighting for the love of country, defeating an army of 2,600,000 Persians fighting as conscripts. In the Revolutionary War, the first war of our country, at the Battle of Trenton, Washington, with his volunteers, captured the British colonel, Rahl, and his thousand Hessian conscripts without the loss of a single American. And yet they say that the compulsory system is the only one and is a new and modern idea.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is the gentleman certain that the Greek Army was a volunteer army?

Mr. FIELDS. I only know what history says.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is the gentleman sure that history says that?

Mr. FIELDS. The Persian King, Xerxes, himself in speaking of the Greeks and in reasoning how they could not reckon with his forces, made the following statement:

Besides, continued the king, there is a great difference in the character of the troops. The Greeks are all freemen, while my soldiers are all slaves—bound absolutely to do my bidding, without complaint or murmur. Such soldiers as mine, who are habituated to submit entirely to the will of another and who live under the continual fear of the lash, might perhaps be forced to go into battle against a great superiority of numbers or under other manifest disadvantages; but freemen, never.

Let us see what the historian says about the Persian Army. Abbott, the great historian, says, in speaking of the Persian soldiers:

They were all slaves and had been torn from their rural homes all over the Empire by a merciless conscription from which there was no possible escape.

That brings us to the point as to whether or not a volunteer army is a more effective force than a conscripted army, and all history from that just cited, during the reign of Xerxes down to the present, bears testimony that the volunteer army is the most effective, and I am unwilling to go on record by my silence or otherwise as indorsing the attacks which have been made upon and the arguments which have been made against the volunteer system and the service previously rendered under it. Men must fight willingly to fight effectively. The volunteer always fights willingly and eagerly; the unwilling conscript does not.

Our Government was founded through the efforts of our volunteers. Our flag was planted by our volunteers. Our battles have been fought and our victories won by volunteers, who fought not by compulsion but as freemen, fighting willingly, not grudgingly; fighting spiritually, not mechanically. And, Mr. Chairman, their loyalty, their valor, and their achievements have been the pride of America, which through the efforts and under the protection of volunteer forces under a volunteer system has become the richest, the grandest, and the mightiest Nation on earth. But now that system which permits warriors to fight as freemen—that system under which our Government was established and has been maintained—is attacked and its destruction sought. It is to be overthrown by the militarists of the land and supplanted by a compulsory system without evidence that it has failed in the past or is likely to do so in the future.

We hear much said in the arguments against the volunteer system of the mistakes made by Great Britain at the beginning

of the present war under her volunteer system. Well, let us see if these charges are well founded. Statistics show that Great Britain enlisted 5,000,000 men under her volunteer system before she adopted conscription, and has enlisted one and one-half million in about the same length of time since she adopted conscription. Therefore her mistakes were not due to the volunteer system, but to her indiscriminate methods of enlisting or assigning her men. She permitted men to enlist as privates who should have been held in reserve as officers, or who were most valuable men in their munitions factories or other industries essential to the support of the army, thereby disorganizing her industrial and productive forces. But we have guarded against those mistakes in the bill under consideration. We give the Secretary of War wide discretion in the enlistment of men either under the volunteer system or by conscription. Under this bill the volunteer or conscript will be examined as to his usefulness in industrial pursuits, and if it is found or decided that he is more valuable in civil or industrial life than at the front, or that he has children or dependents who need him at home, he is not permitted to enlist. Therefore if the volunteer plan remains in the bill we will have none of the mistakes that were made by Great Britain of which you have heard so much.

I referred a few moments ago to the real issue at stake between those of us who oppose compulsory military service except as an absolute necessity and those who favor it for both war and peace times. The real issue is this: Our hopes are their fears. We hope that the volunteer provision will be retained in the bill and that the President will exercise the authority which it gives him by issuing a call for volunteers and that that call will prove so successful that it will not be necessary to again fasten upon this country the conscription that we experienced during the Civil War, which was neither satisfactory nor profitable, and which was precipitated by the War Department as a step toward compulsory service, as I will endeavor to show before I conclude. And they fear it; they fear that if the volunteer provision is retained that he will issue the call and that the call will be responded to by such a mighty force of fighting men that it will never be necessary to conscript a single soldier to fight this war, and that is the only issue.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman mean to intimate that the success of the volunteer system would interfere with the future plans of Army officers—is that the gentleman's thought?

Mr. FIELDS. I mean to say this: That if the President should issue a call for volunteers, to be raised in local or State units so that neighbor could go by the side of neighbor and friend by the side of friend, that call, in my opinion, would be responded to by the fighting men of America in such numbers that the power of conscription would never have to be exercised, and the hope of those who are trying to force permanent conscription onto the country would go glimmering and their propaganda would fall to the ground. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman prepared to yield now for a question in connection with what he was discussing a few moments ago?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman made reference to Col. Roosevelt. I do not wish to embarrass my colleague by this question, and if it will embarrass him he need not answer. It has been rumored that there may be reasons other than military ones why Col. Roosevelt's proposition to raise a volunteer army has not been accepted. Does the gentleman know anything about that and does he think such a matter should figure in this crisis?

Mr. FIELDS. I do not know why his services have not been accepted, and I do not care to discuss that phase of the subject. But if what you indicate be true—and I am not charging that it is—I will say that this is not the time for figuring on or quibbling over who shall have the glories that are to be carried back from the battle fields of Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I referred a moment ago to the exercise of the power of conscription in the Civil War. Let us see what number of the men who fought in that war on the side of the Union were conscripted. The records of the War Department show that only 2.3 per cent of the total were conscripted; the remainder, or 97.7 per cent, were volunteers. I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I have read that 60 per cent of those conscripted into the service deserted. Whether that be true or not I do not say, but we do know this: You know and I know and every other man knows that a man does more effectively the service that he likes, performs more effectively that duty which he performs willingly, than do the men who are forced to perform it. There is no question about that. Gen. SHERWOOD states that he had in his command 70 men who had been conscripted, and that 68 of them deserted. Before I get away from it I desire to refer a little further to this charge

that the volunteer system was a failure. What occurred when the Civil War began? Men volunteered faster than they could take them and in greater numbers than they could use them. Reading from the reports of Provost Marshal Fry, I find the following:

Under the authority of Congress referred to in the foregoing, a force of 637,126 men was in the service in the spring of 1862. The popular impression was then that this immense number would be sufficient for overthrowing the military power of the rebellion and putting down all armed resistance to the Federal Government. Congress and the people deemed it necessary to check the enormous current expenditures by discontinuing the enlistment of men for the Army. The popular demand was yielded to, and on the 3d of April the volunteer recruiting service was closed by general order from the War Department. Under this order recruitment for the Army was immediately stopped, property at the rendezvous sold, and the offices closed throughout the country. Owing to the unexpected and unfavorable turn of the fortunes of war in the following months and the consequent depletion of the armies in the field, the recruiting service was resumed by general orders June 6, 1862.

When the war started men came and offered their services in numbers so great that they could not be used, and they were turned away without recognition of their loyalty and their patriotism, and as soon as it was seen that further enlistments or further recruits were necessary demand was started throughout the country for a conscription law, which was placed upon the statute books without delay. And that law stifled the spirit of patriotism, made the war unpopular in the North, and resulted in unrest and riots in many sections. It took more to suppress the riots than the conscripts were worth.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman spare me time there for one more suggestion, and I promise not to interrupt him any more?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman, I am sure, recalls with reference to the situation in Kentucky at that time that there were a number of units organized in our State that wanted and tried to get mustered into the Federal service, but could not, as the quota was filled, and they, therefore, went on and served, some of them for a year and a half, along with the Regular soldiers, and were never mustered in because there was no room for them under the call. In some counties in the section of the State, where the gentleman and I come from, the total number of volunteers was greater in the Union Army alone than the total number of voters then in those counties. One of these counties formerly in my district is now in the seventh district of Kentucky, now represented by my friend, Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. FIELDS. I understand that is correct. Kentucky discharged her duty then, as she had previously done, and is ready to do so again.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Yesterday one of the Members made the statement that the volunteers could not be used, they would come more rapidly than they would be utilized, and the gentleman's reading this morning from the Record would indicate something of the same sort. Is there weight in that argument that volunteers would come so rapidly that they could not be utilized, and therefore later would be ineffective because they would not offer themselves again? Is there argument in that or not?

Mr. FIELDS. I think there is much weight in the argument that men would come faster than they could be used, but if I were administering the laws I would then and there register them. Then I would enroll them in the service just as fast as I could get to them, and turn no man away who wanted to fight for his country.

Mr. LANGLEY. In other words, conscription would be rather a restraint upon enlistments, which is contrary to the argument they have been advancing here in support of it. The volunteers would really come too fast for them.

Mr. FIELDS. We could most assuredly raise an army more rapidly by voluntary enlistment at this time.

Let me suggest this: In this crisis no one wants to hamstring the administration and the Commander in Chief in this war. But we must all recognize the fact that we need the best fighting force that can be had, and who, in your opinion, would make the best fighters in the trenches of Europe if our boys shall have to fight there? An army of youths, two-sevenths of whom are under 21 years of age, undeveloped physically and mentally, many of them with no spirit of fight within their bosom, or an army of sturdy volunteers who had enlisted because of their desire to fight? Why, the question answers itself. Men upon this floor have criticized those who fear to fight, yet they can not help it. They were not the masters of their creation. God Almighty created them. I have long since decided that it is not proper or right for me to criticize my fellow man

because his Maker made him different from me. This is not a time to inflict punishment upon men because they are not brave. This is a time to wage the battles of the United States to a successful victory. Let them be waged with brave men, not cowards; with fully developed men, not boys who are but mere children, unable to endure the hardships of war.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. BATHRICK. Is it not a fact that the average age of the soldiers of the Northern Army was about 19 years?

Mr. FIELDS. It is; and it is also a fact that statistics of the War Department show that for every death in battle there were more than two deaths by curable and largely preventable diseases, largely because of the tenderness of these youths and their susceptibility to disease. [Applause.]

Mr. BATHRICK. Well, will not the gentleman concede that under more modern surgical methods in the field this would not occur?

Mr. FIELDS. I am unwilling to concede that undeveloped youths under any condition are not more susceptible to disease than the developed man. Now, one other point—

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without regard to any personal opinion as to the minimum age limit, what is there about boys of 19 or 20 years that makes them more susceptible to disease than a man of 40?

Mr. FIELDS. I rely upon the highest authority I can find upon this subject, which I accept rather than an opinion of my own or others who are not authorities on the subject.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. JAMES. Does not the gentleman know that the death of these volunteers, boys of the age of 19 to 21, was due to the incompetency of the volunteer officers? If the gentleman had experience in 1898 he would know that.

Mr. FIELDS. There may have been many causes for the numerous deaths, but the best authorities that we have teach us that boys of that age are not as hardy as men fully developed, and we can not get away from that fact.

Mr. HARDY. And they are not capable of taking care of themselves.

Mr. FIELDS. The remark of the gentleman from Texas is apt, that they are not capable of caring for themselves. They have not the will power to resist temptation, they have not the control of their appetites and passions like mature men have.

Now, let us come to the question of selective conscription. Those who favor it say that it is an equitable proposition because it is just like our taxing system that every man is forced to perform the duty that he owes to his Government. Every man pays taxes, but every man does not fight for his country. You propose to apply the selective-draft system to citizens of designated ages and then call from that class certain ones upon whom the call chances to drop by lottery, and in this way we may call one man who is practically useless in the Army and leave by his side another one who is full of the spirit of fight and who wants to enlist, but who under the system is prohibited, who would be a most valuable man in the ranks. Therefore the Government suffers the loss of a good soldier and accepts a poor one. You can not legislate equity into war or into the distribution of its burdens. There is no equity in it; it is a cruel process that we must unfortunately resort to for the preservation of our national life, but when it comes to distributing the burdens there is no way by which it can be done equitably unless it would be to draft all men, each to serve the same length of time, and even then the burdens would be greater on some than on others because of differences of temperament, so there is no way of equally distributing the burdens of war.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. FESS. I am trying to seek light; I have an open mind on this matter. The selective conscription will leave the man in the munitions factory receiving \$3 to \$5 a day that he is now commanding and take the boy who is not thus employed and send him to the line at \$15 a month. What will the parents or the citizenry of the locality seeing this feel and say as to the discrimination? What effect will it have upon the citizenry in the discrimination?

Mr. FIELDS. That is the seriousness of the proposition.

Mr. FESS. That is the thing that is troubling me.

Mr. FIELDS. That is the seriousness of the proposition. We must all admit the fact that, regardless of what our personal opinion may be, we must deal with public sentiment in this great conflict. Laws are made by public sentiment; they are exe-

cuted by public sentiment, and the law that does not meet public approval will bring to the country we can not tell what in a crisis like this. That thought has given me no little concern. But let us hope that whatever is done will receive universal approval and prove most successful.

Now, I must hasten on. I return now to the point upon which I absolutely differ with the administration and upon which I can not yield, and that is the minimum age limit. [Applause.] When I started the fight in my committee to raise the minimum age limit from 19 to 21 I was told that I would stand alone, but I did not believe it, for I knew that I was right and felt that this Nation could not afford at this time to commit such an error. This is not a matter of sentiment or opinion, it is a question of conscience, because it touches the principles of humanity at the present and affects the race in the future.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. McKENZIE. In the interest of fairness will the gentleman from Kentucky, my colleague, not say to the committee that many of those of us who stand for conscription agree with him on that proposition.

Mr. FIELDS. I was just coming to that point, if the gentleman will permit me. There was opposition to my efforts to raise the minimum age limit when I started the fight, but every man upon that committee is a good, honest, conscientious thinker, and when the proposition was finally passed upon by the committee I am proud to say that my amendment to raise the minimum age limit from 19 to 21 received 20 votes to 1 vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. WISE. Will the gentleman yield at that point, because I think it is important?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. WISE. Is it not true that while we are deceiving ourselves on the proposition that we raise the age limits to 21 and 40 that under the testimony of the Secretary of War we are taking his bill wherein every man who is actually called to the service will be between 21 and 25? Did not he say that he would not consent at all unless he had the right to call them in groups, and he would call the first group first and in that way he would get them between those ages? And you never would get them above those ages.

Mr. FIELDS. If my colleague will permit me, I am discussing the minimum age limit, and we do say positively in our bill prepared by the Military Committee that the minimum age limit shall be 21. I will reach the proposition to which the gentleman refers before I conclude.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not 19 in the Senate bill, which is now being considered in that body?

Mr. FIELDS. It is 19 in the Senate bill, and we will have that to deal with in the future, and I learn that an amendment will be offered in this body to reduce the minimum age to 19. I therefore desire to devote a few minutes' discussion to it at this time so the membership may have time to think over it carefully, after which I am sure you will sustain the decision of the House committee or House conferees.

Now, why do I oppose conscripting the youth of this country for this military service? First, this is a man's war and should be fought by the men of this country. Man owes his second duty to his government; his first to his God. But the child by divine right belongs to the mother, and the Government should protect her in that right, and I do not propose to consent that the first wound inflicted in this war shall be inflicted upon the heart of American motherhood. [Applause.] Oh, you say, the boy after he is 21 must go, and what is the difference? There is a great deal of difference. When a man reaches his majority the question of his duty in war is a question between him and his government. His mother yields him, because it is his duty to go. But call the tender youth, who the framers of the Constitution said because of his physical and mental immaturity is incapable of participating in the Government, and subject him to the burdens and the ravages of war to die for the country in the Government of which he can not participate because of his immaturity, and you outrage justice and crucify the principles of humanity. I pray God that the Congress of the United States and the manhood of America may have the strength and the courage to forego the commission of such an act.

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. LUNN. I want to ask my colleague whether he believes it is the intention or the desire of the War Department to fight this war in the trenches or anywhere else with youths under 21 years of age?

Mr. FIELDS. We are not dealing with intentions, we are dealing with facts, we are dealing with a concrete proposition, a definite plan, presented to us for raising an army for probably

the most arduous military duty that any army of this country has ever faced, and that says plainly that at least a portion of the Army, and probably all of it, shall be boys under 21 years of age.

And another thought in connection with that, my dear sir; we must realize that when men are called into the Army for this war they are called for service. They are not called to pleasure resorts; they are not called to places for mental and physical development, but they are called for arduous military duty. And when you go into the home and conscript the youth who is still under his mother's care the effect is just the same upon her and upon society, whether you are going to put him into the trenches two years from now or to-morrow. There is no difference in the moral effect upon the home. Therefore I refuse to strike this unnecessary blow at the homes of the United States, which have enough to suffer, God knows, at the best.

Mr. LUNN. Yesterday you asked me if I did not want to be fair. I answered, "Yes." I would like to ask you the same question. Do you not want to be fair?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. LUNN. Do you believe the President of the United States, or the Secretary of War, or any member of this minority, or any Member of this House that favors conscription wants to strike a blow at the home?

Mr. FIELDS. I am not speaking of intentions. I am speaking of the plan we have been asked to write into law and what it will do if enacted into law, as requested. I am speaking of the plan of the General Staff to make this army out of boys under 21 years of age, and the gentleman knows that that is their plan, which they say has the approval of the President, which I very much regret. I contend that such a law would strike a painful and unnecessary blow at the homes of America. I am not impugning the motives of the President, but I have a right, and it is my duty as I see it, to differ with him on this vital question. I realize how far superior he is to me, but still he is a human being; and I read in Holy Writ that there is none perfect. No; not one. Then, all who are not perfect are subject to err. What man has ever lived, save the Son of God, who did not at some time or under some circumstances commit errors?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Let me read from the hearings before the committee in reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN], who questioned the Secretary of War on that very point. The record reads as follows:

Mr. LUNN. That, it seems to me, is what we are doing now.

Secretary BAKER. We are going to enroll all of the boys between the ages of 19 and 25 years, and then choose by lot, getting some 20 years old, and so on.

Mr. LUNN. Why not make the limit 40 years?

Secretary BAKER. We would then be interfering too much with the industries.

Mr. LUNN. It is not a class of boys 19 years of age, but a class composed of men between the ages of 18 and 25 years.

Secretary BAKER. That would be the effect of the operation of this draft. A man will draw lot No. 1, and that man would go with the first 500,000 troops, while the man who drew lot No. 2 would go with the second 500,000 troops.

Mr. LUNN. Men from 25 years up would be entirely eliminated from any possible conscription?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

That was the testimony of the Secretary of War upon the very question the gentleman asked.

Mr. FIELDS. I thank my colleague, Gov. SHALLENBERGER, for calling attention to the testimony before the committee. And in addition to that, the plan of the General Staff was written up by John Temple Graves, one of the most prominent writers of America, after he had conferred with a member of the General Staff, and was published in the New York American on April 17, and probably in many other papers, as well as referred to repeatedly during the discussion of this bill. And neither the General Staff, nor anyone representing it, has disputed or challenged the statements of Mr. Graves. His article reads as follows:

GENERAL STAFF TO CALL OUT FIRST 500,000 BOYS UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE.

[By John Temple Graves, staff correspondent of the New York American.]

WASHINGTON, April 16.

Just exactly how conscription or, as the President denominates it, "selective draft" will proceed is, of course, the most interesting of all questions just now connected with the organization of the new American army. I have from the Army and the General Staff standpoint the plan as it presents itself now and as it will prevail until Congress should alter the plan of the General Staff.

The War Department has sent to Congress its own idea and the idea of the Commander in Chief that conscription should be voted first and let the volunteer system come as an incident of it.

The President's wish, which is conscription or "selective draft," will eventually be voted by Congress.

FIRST ARMY OF 500,000.

The first grand army of 500,000 men, according to the staff officers, will be raised under the selective draft from men not over 20 years of age. It will be the "first class." These selective conscripts will not necessarily be kept undistributed. The majority, however, will not be assigned to other divisions than that created by the first general levy.

The process of the original levy of the beardless first army of a half million was explained to-day by a member of the General Staff.

First. The whole country is to be divided into 16 military districts, the limits of which have not yet been defined.

Second. A general officer with a complete staff is to be assigned to certain cities or localities as headquarters. These officers will report primarily to the departmental commanders. The general in command in the territorial division will select and equip camps for the selected conscripts.

REGISTRATION FIRST STEP.

Third. When the bill embodying this plan is passed, the postmasters of the second, third, and fourth classes and the rural free delivery carriers are to make registrations listing all the men in their sections who are from 19 years of age to 25 years. The bill prescribes the age as from 18 to 25, but the Army plan denominates the first men as "the 19-year-old class." They will probably be 19 years old before they are actually assigned to service.

Fourth. When the registration is completed the War Department will officially call out "class 19" first. The selected men will repair to the camps selected. Those who are exempted will be allowed to depart. Those who after physical examination are pronounced sound will be enrolled.

Fifth. The selected men will then go into immediate and vigorous military training. It is proposed by the General Staff to raise 150,000 officers and men under present laws to man the first 500,000 men. But in the meantime the training will proceed with all possible energy and dispatch under the officers now available.

After training the first army will be assigned to companies, battalions, regiments, troops, squadrons, batteries, brigades, and divisions until the military units have all been completed.

WILL BE READY IN YEAR.

It is believed all this can be done, with the virile adaptability of American youth, within less than a year after the arrival of the men in the training camps. The staff officers express full confidence there will be enough men of the "19-year class" as registered in the postal districts, to make the complement of 500,000 and to render unnecessary the immediate calling of the "20-year class."

If, however, the registration of 19-year-old men is not sufficient, the "20-year class" will be called, and out of this second class will be selected by lot a number sufficient to make up the first 500,000.

This latter contingency, is, however, so remote a contingency in the judgment of staff officers that they give it little consideration.

It is reasonably certain that this is the plan under which the first American army will be selected and trained for the battle field.

Mr. FIELDS. Now, aside from the principles of humanity to which I have referred, let us take the testimony from some of the authorities that we have in this and other countries on this subject.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield before he enters upon that?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] to the gentleman now on the floor, is a conundrum to me. If these boys who are to be conscripted are not to fight the battles, what are they for? What is the purpose of it?

Mr. FIELDS. I can not understand the reasoning of the gentleman from New York. I do not know what he means.

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. No; I can not yield further.

Mr. LUNN. I yielded to you very generously yesterday.

Mr. FIELDS. You did not yield the whole of your time to me, neither did I ask it.

Mr. LUNN. I do not ask you for your whole time.

Mr. FIELDS. Now, Mr. Chairman, aside from the principles of humanity involved in the proposition to place the burdens of fighting this war upon the immature youths of the country, there is another principle of vital concern to society. The youths of this generation will be the men of the next generation, and they have a right to develop mentally and physically under normal conditions to fit them for their future responsibilities. If we force upon them in their tender state the burdens of this war we unfit those of them who may survive the conflict for their future responsibilities and do an injustice to their posterity. We can not afford to do it. We must live after the war as well as during the war, so let us protect and develop the children of to-day, who must meet the responsibilities of the future.

I have said that boys of 19 and 20 are unfit for military service, and I am going to prove it by eminent authority—both by experts on juvenile psychology and warriors who have seen real service, including the greatest of all warriors, Napoleon.

Dr. Sargent, of Harvard University, in testifying before the Senate committee, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, said:

In the medical department of the report of the Secretary of War for 1898 we find the following paragraph in relation to the health of the troops in the Spanish War:

"In my opinion the reduction of the age limit from 21 to 18 years and the haste with which the volunteer regiments were organized and mustered into service were responsible for much of the sickness which

was reported in the early days of their camp life. All military experience shows that young men under 21 years break down readily under the strain of war service; and every regiment had many of these youths in its ranks. Medical examiners were appointed to testify to the physical qualifications of each man before acceptance, but, notwithstanding this, which at the time was characterized in the press as a very rigorous procedure, so many men were afterwards found on the sick lists of the camps unfit for service from causes existing prior to enlistment that special arrangements had to be made for their discharge."

Sir William Aitken, Knt., M. D., F. R. S., professor of pathology in the Army Medical School of England, in his book on the Growth of the Recruit and the Young Soldier, sets forth the result of much study and experience on this question. He cites many military authorities to show that soldiers of less than 20 years of age have proved rather an incumbrance than an assistance to an army. For example, M. Coche:

"Recruits at 18 years of age are commonly unfit for the duties of an army. If they do not possess unusual strength they pass two, three, or more years in the hospital, if they are not discharged from the service altogether before that time."

Again, he quotes Dr. Parks:

"There is no doubt that to send young lads of 18 to 20 into the field is not only a lamentable waste of material but is positive cruelty at that age. Such soldiers, as Napoleon said, merely strew the roadsides and fill the hospitals. The most effective armies have been those in which the soldiers have been 22 years of age."

To quote Sir William Aitken himself:

"It will be my duty to show you that the younger the recruit under 22 years of age the less perfect is the growth of his skeleton, and of such important organs as the heart, the lungs, the liver, and the kidneys, the less is his body weight, and bulk, and the less able is he for military work. It is hardly reasonable to expect the same work and exertion out of a lad 18 to 20 as out of a full-grown man of 25 to 30 years of age."

It is interesting to note the following in Sir William Aitken's book:

"In the annual report of the Surgeon General of the United States Army for 1885 it is shown that a greater proportion of invalids was furnished by troops under 31 years of age, while up to the age of 25 the rate proved so much above the mean for the whole Army that the Surgeon General states, 'It may fairly be questioned whether the services rendered by these young men are equal to the cost of their maintenance.'"

I shall not quote the further authorities that I have on this subject which are numerous, but shall put them, or a part of them, in the Record.

Now, in conclusion, let me repeat: We must live after the war. In our hysteria that something must be done to-day let us not take the youths of the country who are not physically and mentally developed and subject them to the ravages of this war, which would necessarily affect them and their posterity, thereby affecting the race. The deciding battle in this war will not be fought to-morrow. We must get an army at the quickest moment possible, but when we get that army let it be an army of men and not an army of children. Let it be an army that can discharge its duties as our volunteer fathers discharged their duties in the wars of the past. Let us not repeat the mistakes of the Civil War by conscripting youths into the military service, which made the death rate in that war appalling to the people of this Nation.

This question may come back to the House later on, because in the other body they are standing for the minimum age of 19; and I, for that reason, submit these observations at this time for the consideration of the membership of this body. As I have previously said, my main and absolutely uncompromising difference with the administration is upon this point. I stand by not only my judgment but also my conviction on this question, a conviction that I am unwilling to yield, a conviction that I would not yield, regardless of what effect my refusal to do so might have upon my political fortunes; but that does not concern me when a principle of such magnitude as this one is involved. It requires a spirit of self-sacrifice to take any stand that is not indorsed by the President and the Secretary of War at this time, but I am willing and ready to make any sacrifice that may be required of me for the course I have taken in this matter. Let me add, in conclusion, that if the time ever comes when men in this body, through fear that they may incur the displeasure of the executive authorities or subject themselves to criticism, shall fail to stand by their honest convictions on questions which they believe affect not only the basic principles of our civic institutions but the fundamental principles of humanity as well, then and there the pillars upon which rests the principles of representative government will begin to crumble. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling to yield on this point, regardless of what it may bring to me in the future, and I trust and pray that the membership of this House will stand for the protection of the children of America against the burdens and ravages of this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves two minutes of his time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman—Mr. FIELDS, of Kentucky—who has just taken his seat has re-

ferred to the personal assault of certain newspapers upon the chairman of this committee and the members of the committee who have signed the majority report. I wish to preface my remarks here this morning by expressing my emphatic dissent from these unjustifiable reflections upon the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the gentlemen who have united with him in signing the majority report. My association with these gentlemen has been so pleasant and so instructive that it gives me pleasure to bear testimony to the diligence, the patience, and the honesty of purpose with which they have discharged their duties in reference to the measure now before this body. Surrounded here by their colleagues, I hardly think it necessary even to pause to pay a passing tribute to the conspicuous ability and the exalted patriotism of the Hon. S. HUBERT DENT, of Alabama, and the other gentlemen to whom I have referred. [Applause.]

It was with the utmost diffidence I ventured to differ with him and the majority of my colleagues on the Military Committee in regard to the important matter now before this body; but overshadowing the committee stands the form and figure of the great President of the American people. He has had the advice of the expert military men of this country. He has followed the bloody drama that has been enacted in Europe and can retrace the progress of our allies through the blunders which they committed. He has now at his elbow the wisest statesmen of the world, the ablest military commanders of this age or any other age, and I take it that we ought to weigh well our own conclusions when we attempt to depart from the advice which he gives to us. Furthermore, he is, under the Constitution, the Commander in Chief of the armies and the navies of the country, as well as the adviser of Congress. Upon him rests the responsibility to wage this war to a successful conclusion. I take it that I can render no greater service to the best interests of my constituents and the interests of my country than by standing firmly and steadfastly behind his leadership. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the emergency which confronts us. We are at war with the greatest military power on earth—savage and cruel in its methods—upon whose solemn obligations no reliance can be placed. We must raise an army adequate to our defense. It takes time to raise an army, to equip and train it for action. A raw recruit is not considered fit until he has had 12 months' intensive training. Our trained men are barely sufficient to enforce the law within our own territories against domestic disorder. It is in violation of no state secret to say that many months must elapse before we can be adequately prepared for defense, much less for offensive war. Our contributions to this war for a long time to come must be food, munitions, and credit to our allies. We can not wait to prepare until the Germans thunder at our gates. We would then be too late, and we would deservedly go sounding down the ages as a nation of fatuous fools. All are agreed upon the immediate and pressing exigency of having an army of sufficient proportions to meet all possibilities.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to confine my remarks to what is actually before this body. The committee has reported a bill and the minority have filed a dissenting report, bearing exclusively upon one feature of the bill. The only matter before the House at present is the bill of the committee, the majority report and the minority report, and the only point of dissent in the minority report is the method of raising the army whether by the system known as volunteering or by the system known as the selective draft. There is nothing before this body which involves the age of those to be selected. The bill reported by the committee fixes the age limits for the selective draft between the ages of 21 and 40, and the minority report does not dissent therefrom. The age limit therefore is not the question before this body. I stand on the bill as reported in this respect. Therefore, it seems to me that all the matters which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] has debated here are absolutely irrelevant to any question that is now before this body.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. I suppose the gentleman refers to the age limit?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. He does not mean to say what he really stated, that all the matters I debated were irrelevant?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No. I meant the greater portion of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman understands that I stated that the other body was passing the bill, with the minimum age of 19, and I discussed that feature at this time in order to call the attention of the House to that fact, because it will be before us later.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I stand with the committee on that proposition, that we must raise the age limit, and I do not care to be diverted from the few remarks that I will ask this body to hear from me in order to discuss a proposition that is not before the House at the present time. [Applause.] Nor is it a question, Mr. Chairman, of raising an army immediately. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] said yesterday that if you would issue a call for volunteers in 48 hours we would have an army, while under the selective draft it would take from three to five months to get the machinery in operation. What would we do with an army in 48 hours? The Secretary of War has said it would be a disorganized mob here, without the possibility of caring for it, and that the three to five months' delay required for providing the machinery of the selective draft was necessary in order to be able to take care of the recruits when they came.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman object to the volunteer system because he is afraid we are going to get an army to fight this war?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am coming to the volunteer system shortly. I will show you that you have not got a volunteer system in your proposal. I state here that you are saying you can get an army in 48 hours under the volunteer system, when the Secretary of War has said that he could not handle an army of 500,000 men in any less time than it is necessary to take to put into effect this draft system.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will my colleague permit a question there?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. My colleague from Virginia is a very accomplished Shakespearian scholar, as I have occasion to know.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I had to yield to his superior knowledge on a former occasion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does my colleague remember that Sir John Falstaff describes exactly the kind of an army that would be raised under this system?

But look you, pray, all you that kiss my lady Peace at home, that our armies join not in a hot day; for, by the Lord, I take but two shirts out with me.

[Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I think the illustration of the gentleman from Vermont is very apt.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Is Sir John Falstaff one of the high military expert authorities to whom the gentleman refers?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have not referred to him. I stand on the report of the Secretary of War. You are standing on Sir John Falstaff.

Mr. HARDY. No; I am not. It is the gentleman from Vermont who cites him.

Mr. GORDON. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question right there?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. Is it your understanding that it is not the purpose of the majority to train these volunteers at all?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; I understand they will be trained.

Mr. GORDON. Why do you describe them as a mob, then?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. In due and proper time, under the selective draft system, we expect to call the recruits to come and we will then be able to train them.

Mr. GORDON. You are afraid they will come too quick.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; that is exactly what we are. We do not want them here until we are ready for them.

Mr. GORDON. You do not need to have them until you are ready for them.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. What do you suppose we are going to do with a mob without arms, without equipment, without any housing for them, the men without training and without officers to train them?

Mr. GORDON. We are not going to bring them here. We are going to leave them at home until we are ready for them.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is where they will be pretty apt to stay. [Applause.] Now, I will ask not to be interrupted unless some information is really desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to be interrupted.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Now, as I have said, the question of these details is not before this body at present. Neither the question of the age limit, nor the question of bringing an army here immediately, nor the machinery of operating the selective draft is before this body; but the sole and only question is whether we shall have this army raised by the volunteer system or by a selective draft. Mr. Chairman, let us understand terms. Is that a volunteer system where the men are driven into the ranks by the scorn and contempt of their neighbors? Yet the testimony of the British officer before our committee was to the effect—

Mr. WISE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; if it is for information.

Mr. WISE. A question for information. The gentleman speaks of men being driven into the Army by the scorn of their neighbors. Do you suppose that some of these men over 25 years of age are afraid they will be forced to go?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have just this moment said that the question of the age limit was not a matter that was before this body at this time. I have stated that I indorsed the plan of the committee in making the age limit between 21 and 40 and that I did not consider that the age limit proposed by the Secretary of War between 19 and 25 was at all essential or a vital feature of the draft system. I think that everyone of military age, not under 21, should be the subject of the selective draft. Now, I hope I may be permitted to continue my discussion of the subject which is actually before this House for its present consideration. It has been claimed here that the volunteer system has been tried out in England and its dependencies and that it has proved a success. I was about to quote the testimony of the British officer of the methods that were resorted to to obtain the so-called volunteers. He testified that the most extraordinary methods were brought to bear upon the men liable to military service in order to force them into the army. Everything that intense public scorn could suggest was resorted to. I need not enter into details. They are perfectly well known to those who have cared to investigate the matter. Such men were no more volunteers in the true sense than the man who is dragged there by the strong arm of the law.

Now, I ask for the correction of another term which is frequently used here. In the late Civil War both North and South, after every man had been enlisted who could be induced to do so voluntarily, by conscription acts sought to bring in the refuse. Of course, conscription at the end, after all had volunteered who would do so, instead of conscription at the beginning, which would have been fair to all alike, brought a stigma upon every man who was thus finally conscripted in the Army; but I deny that the system recommended here by the Secretary of War has anything in common with conscription of that character.

Under the selective-draft system every man liable to military service is called upon to come forward and register. He then waits and bides his time until his country calls for him in the manner and according to the procedure prescribed. When he comes forward in response to this call and puts his name upon the registration list, he is as much a volunteer as the man who goes to the recruiting office and has his name put upon the recruiting books. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it not a fact that the bill provides that a man may be imprisoned for six months or a year upon a day's notice by the Federal court if he does not go?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is your bill, too, exactly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is that man a volunteer when he has the penitentiary behind him?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Your provision for volunteers has a conscription act in fact behind it, coupled with its provisions for imprisonment by a Federal court. I propose to come to that later. I will not be diverted at this time from the line of my argument. I say that the man who goes under this selective draft and registers his name to wait his turn for the call of his country is far more a volunteer than the man who goes under the lash of public scorn and ostracism and is recruited. [Applause.] It is not the hullabaloo boy who is always the fighter. The man who quietly and in the fear of God discharges his whole duty in response to the laws of his country is just as apt to be the reliable soldier as the man whose valor is always on dress parade. Now, let us look a little at the basic principles of these systems. Why should one man volunteer and an-

other man stay at home? Why should one man go to the front and another man get his job at home? Why should one man make every sacrifice, even unto the sacrificing of his life at the front, while another man stays at home and gets the benefit of army contracts? Where is the first semblance of equal rights and corresponding duties in such a system as this? The selective draft is based upon the right as well as the duty of every man to serve his State in time of war. It applies to the rich and the poor alike, to the high and low alike. No distinction is based here upon the willing or the unwilling, upon the aristocracy of birth or of wealth. All must respond to do his share in carrying a common burden. The volunteer system feeds upon the patriotism and the zealotry of the real useful citizen and fosters the selfishness and greed of the slacker. On the other hand, the selective draft has its foundation in the Jeffersonian principles of equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

As an illustration, I desire to read here the letter from a valued friend, Hon. George W. Settle, of Flint Hill, Va., which I ask to have read as a part of my remarks:

FLINT HILL, VA., April 22, 1917.

Judge T. W. HARRISON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE HARRISON: I want to convey to you my approval and appreciation of the high stand you are taking on the "selective draft" measure now pending before your Military Committee.

I can but feel that if the sensible citizens of this Nation understood just what this measure means that there would be universal demand for its passage.

With the urgent call for producers and the lack of true patriotism on the part of those who are not producers, it seems to me the only way we can hope to meet the crying needs of the day.

I have three boys, all of whom are producers and badly needed on my farm, yet, when the President called, with my hearty consent they made application for enlistment in the Second Regiment of Virginia and are now awaiting for orders; at the same time they were the only volunteers from this district, which evidences just what the result would be, comparatively speaking, under the volunteer system. The very ones who amount to something in the way of producing would volunteer and the ones who could very well be spared would not volunteer, which would prove a calamity at this trying period of our national history.

Your constituents, if not now, will after they understand and applaud you for your gallant and splendid fight for this the only fair and just way by which to raise an army such as we must have to prove ourselves worthy the past record of Americans.

With my best wishes and kind regards, I am,

Very truly, yours,

GEO. W. SETTLE.

I say that the volunteer system is undemocratic, and I say that the system of the selective draft is the only democratic method. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is pleasant for me to reflect that I represent the old county of Albemarle, in which Thomas Jefferson lived and spent the declining years of his life. [Applause.]

In the latter part of his life he lived at Monticello, where he expounded for the benefit of all generations the grand principles of democracy. Here he supervised the foundation of the great University of Virginia, of which he was the father. I hold in my hand a telegram from Hon. Edwin A. Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, and the faculty, indorsing the selective-draft plan. I hold in my hand a petition signed by every member of the faculty of the university and all its administrative officers, indorsing the selective-draft plan. I have received resolutions adopted by a large mass meeting held at Charlottesville under the very shadows of Monticello, indorsing the selective-draft plan. I have received resolutions from the chamber of commerce of the same city, indorsing the selective-draft plan. [Applause.] And now, representing the old county where he claimed his citizenship, I ask permission to read what Thomas Jefferson himself has said.

In a letter to James Monroe, he wrote the following:

But it proves more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier; this was the case with the Greeks and Romans and must be that of every free State. Where there is no oppression there will be no pauper hirelings. We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens, and make military instruction part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Does the gentleman contend that Jefferson favored conscription in that passage? It was universal military training.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I will read you something a little more pertinent.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I would like to hear it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Here it is. In a letter to J. W. Eppes, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

I think the truth must now be obvious, that our people are too happy at home to enter into regular service and that we can not be defended but by making every citizen a soldier, as the Greeks and Romans, who had no standing army; and that in doing this, all must be marshaled, classed by their ages, and every service ascribed to its competent class.

[Applause.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Is that all?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is all, and I thought that was enough. [Applause.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Is it not possible that the entire manhood of the Nation might be drilled and disciplined from a military viewpoint, and at the beginning of any war volunteers be called for?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. What would be the sense of drilling them if you did not want them to fight? [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman permit me to answer what the sense is?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. In this emergency with which we are confronted now, whether we applied the volunteer method or conscriptive method, we want disciplined men in the first place.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to explain my conception of the difference.

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Is it not a fact that by reason of the neglect of this advice of Thomas Jefferson in 1813, in the following year of 1814 this city of Washington was captured by the British and this Capitol was burned? [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The point is well taken. From the earliest colonial days until some years after the Civil War, in Virginia, our statutes required and insisted upon the enrollment of every man of military age into companies, battalions, and regiments, and the duty was imposed, under the penalty of a fine, on every man to report at stated and frequent intervals for drill and instruction. These statutes, some time after the Civil War, were superseded by statutes organizing volunteer companies, and these in turn became, under later statutes, a part of the National Guard. So that the principle announced by President Wilson of universal liability for military service is no new doctrine in Virginia. I have been discussing these two systems from the viewpoint of the individual. Let us consider them now, briefly, from the standpoint of the Government exclusively.

In modern warfare it is just as essential to mobilize the industrial resources of a country as it is to mobilize its armed forces. This is well illustrated by the situation of Germany in the present war. The strangle hold of England on Germany is starvation, and the attempt of Germany by its U-boat warfare has the same intent against England. An army must be fed, as well as the people of a country. The necessary equipment for the army must be provided. The demoralization, therefore, of the industrial conditions of a country would lead as certainly to defeat as the failure to raise an army. The volunteer system ignores all these conditions. Fiery appeals are made to the patriotic to join the Army without regard to the demoralization produced in the agricultural interests or in the manufacturing interests or in the mining interests. The high cost of living bears testimony to the great strain under which the agricultural interests are now laboring. Ought this great industry at this time, so essential to success in war, be subjected to a further strain by the appeals of the Government to patriotic citizens to leave the fields and join the ranks of the Army?

The selective-draft method presents these advantages: First, it raises the Army without question and without doubt. It raises it according to a definite program. The military commander knows exactly what he may count upon. Under the volunteer system the recruiting increases or decreases according to the wave of enthusiasm which may at the time be pervading the country. Second, it raises the Army on a fair and just principle, that every man is liable to service in one capacity or another; and, finally, it raises the Army without disturbing the business interests of the country.

Under the selective draft a man is taken to serve in the ranks who can serve there without disturbing the industrial interests of the country. The man who is needed on the farm to provide the food of the Nation is kept there and not permitted to join the Army.

I know that the majority report of the committee recognizes some sort of an exemption in regard to their volunteer provision as is provided for here in the selective draft.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that provision is identical with the provision in the drafting system.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am going to call your attention to the fact that it is not worth a button. You call for

volunteers and then tell them you will not take them. You are playing at cross purposes.

Mr. CLAYPOOL. The gentleman says they will not take them?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; you call for volunteers, and when one offers you say, "Oh, no; you are not the one we want."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is not that what you propose to do by your enrollment plan, and when he comes you say you do not want him?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Our plan is an exemption plan. If a man is called, he has to be exempted, and we exempt him, but you in your bill you first appeal red hot for people everywhere, and then you say, "Oh, we do not want you."

Mr. CLAYPOOL. How are you going to exempt them?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The machinery is going to exempt them, a civil tribunal provided for in this bill. It is intended to be a local court, and Secretary Baker suggested the local probate court.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. How many local tribunals made up of politicians are going to pass on the life and liberty of American citizens?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Your bill calls for the very same thing. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We also have a plan by which we may not have to resort to it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. And how many political colonels and other officers are you going to have under your plan? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We do not provide for them in the bill; they are appointed, every one of them.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The bill provides for volunteering in regiments or other military units, with their own officers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The President of the United States has authority to appoint them under the volunteer plan when they are called.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, yesterday on the floor, I understood some gentleman, I think from Kentucky, to say that he had three or four captains or colonels down in his country ready to enlist and recruit.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; but the gentleman will admit that if the President of the United States sees fit to appoint them, they should be appointed.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The law provides the open door of opportunity for every one who is desirous of obtaining a commission and who is worthy to have one, and that is through the Officers Reserve Training Corps. [Applause.] Let the officer come in the regular prescribed method which trains him and prepares him for his duties so that he may not be a menace to himself and to those whom he has in his charge.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is by the law which we are going to call these volunteers in. That is what the gentleman is referring to and there can be no other way.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we have heard most of these gentlemen who insist upon interrupting the gentleman from Virginia, and we would like to hear the views of the gentleman from Virginia. [Applause.] I suggest that he maintain his right to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a matter entirely within the control of the gentleman from Virginia. If the gentleman desires the Chair not to permit interruptions, the Chair will not permit them; but as long as the gentleman yields, he has control of his own rights.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Of course, I am always glad to yield if I have the time. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to impress here the importance of the basic difference between the volunteer system which has proved a failure in its true sense in every war and the selective draft—

Mr. CLAYPOOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; my time is speeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I wish to get something in a collective way before this body, and I can not do it if I have to reply to questions, the answers to which the gentlemen can find out in some better way than through me. I have been endeavoring to point out to this body the basic differences between the volunteer system and the selective draft. I have not as yet pointed out any of the features which the bill of the committee proposes. In my judgment the proposition of the majority of the committee contains all the evils of the volunteer system without any of its redeeming features and then provides a conscript provision in its most odious form. If you

are calling for volunteers and want your volunteer patriot, why do you hold over his head the threat of conscription and say, "If you do not come, you patriot, we will drag you"? [Laughter.] This is not the volunteer system of traditional historic romance. You then provide a form of conscription before you give a fair opportunity to the recruit to volunteer. You stigmatize a man with conscription without any just excuse for so doing. Before any real conscription law is put into force, which is intended to be aimed at slackers only, every one should be given a just and fair opportunity to enlist. [Applause.] In other words, the proposed bill of the majority of the committee provides for a volunteer system to which is attached an odious conscript provision, and then throws upon the President the responsibility of putting the odious conscription into force.

No one can be enrolled under this provision for the selective draft without being stigmatized as a slacker, and no one can volunteer under the volunteer provision free from the threat of conscription. Congress then evades its responsibility by placing upon the President the odium of putting the conscript provision into effect. This is not what the President asked for. Under the plan submitted by the Secretary of War, the Regular Army and the National Guard are to be recruited to their full war strength by volunteering. This makes a provision for volunteers to the number of about 700,000 men. This provision for receiving volunteers is amply sufficient to take care of all those adventurous spirits who wish to join the Army and who might not be called under the selective draft. In the opinion of the President, this is as far as volunteering can be safely permitted. The selective draft then goes into operation without any of the stigma being attached to any of those brought in under it as a slacker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I would like to have three minutes in which to close.

Mr. KAHN. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I represent upon the floor of this House a people who have fulfilled every obligation in time of war and in time of peace. The people whom I have the honor to represent are no race of slackers. In every war of this country they have done their full duty. It was in Woodstock, Va., that Muhlenburg doffed his priestly robes to don the uniform of a soldier in the time of our Revolutionary War. Morgan led his brave Virginians through many of the storm centers of that war. I have the honor to represent here the survivors of that gallant band who gave to Jackson his sobriquet of "Stonewall" in the first battle of Manassas. I represent here survivors of that gallant band that climbed the bloody slope of Cemetery Hill at Gettysburg. I represent here the survivors of that band at Appomattox who, after the flag of the South had gone down in blood and tears, returned to ruined homes and devastated fields to face the problems of peace with the same fortitude and courage which they had displayed on a hundred battle fields. Anyone traveling now through the beautiful valley of the Shenandoah, or along the slopes of the Blue Ridge in Piedmont Virginia, will see how faithful and true these men have been since the war in restoring by the labors of peace the land for which they fought and bled to all its pristine beauty. Nor has the present generation been slow in its response to the call of their country in defense of her honor and her liberty. Already companies have been organized in my district and are now in the field ready for any duty which may be given into their charge. So far as I have been able to hear from them, old soldiers and young soldiers prefer that system which the President proposes and which is intended to fairly and equitably distribute the burdens of war. They are not afraid to do their part.

Standing here and speaking for those gallant young soldiers, I believe in the trying times coming that they will ever prove true to the teachings of their fathers and the traditions of their State, and they will call upon the soldiers from all sections to follow them as they carry the Star-Spangled Banner deep into the ranks of their enemy. I believe that they and the people of my district trust in the leadership of the President.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, these companies of patriotic citizens who have already organized themselves down in the home district of Thomas Jefferson will not have a chance to get into this war unless the majority of your committee is sustained. [Applause.] I call your attention to the fact that these gentlemen who have been eulogizing in such glowing words, as has the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], these companies which have been organized of patriotic young men, can not get into the service under his draft system unless you adopt our

amendment and give them a chance to enlist. [Applause.] If I am mistaken about that, I will ask any man to correct me.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. You are right.

Mr. GORDON. But he says, Why do you pass this up to the President? Why, the gentleman opened his speech here by saying what a patriotic duty it was for every citizen to stand by the President. We have been assailed in the newspapers in the United States as traitors to this Nation because we have exercised our own judgment in framing this legislation. We will meet you at Philippi on that proposition. We will not delay by the adoption of the majority proposition the enlistment and raising of an army one minute, and I challenge any man here to deny it. [Applause.] Not a minute. I understand my obligation to support the President. We are giving him all the men that he asks for, and we are trying to give to him a great deal better men than he asks for, if you want to know it. [Applause.] Why, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] says why do you hang up over people's heads the threat of conscription? Why does the General Staff bill hang up the threat of conscription over the Regular Army and the National Guard? It is there.

The great change in the law is as to these extra additional men to be recruited for this emergency, and we adopt the identical language of the War Department bill as to the Regular Army and National Guard. Oh, but he says, the volunteers are mobs, the volunteers are mobs. You heard something some time ago when this war commenced about "Kitchener's mob," but "Kitchener's mob" is winning this war to-day. [Applause.] There is not a conscript Englishman, Scotchman, or Irishman upon the Continent of Europe, not one. They have not the conscripts ready yet. They have got to drill them longer. [Applause.] Now, there has been a good deal of talk and not much light furnished upon the differences in our committee in reference to this legislation. Nobody has told you, and nobody will tell you, why you can not detail a man for private service in a munitions factory as well when he volunteers as if he is conscripted. No; they just try to befuddle you. [Applause.] Capt. Benson testified before our committee, as you have been informed, but you have not been advised of all he testified to. A captain of the English Army, an officer in the regular service, testified that 5,000,000 men volunteered in England. All the men on the Continent fighting to-day are volunteers. They stopped volunteering early in the war because they could not take care of them, they came so fast. The gentleman wants a democratic Army. Do you want to impose upon the boys of this country under 20 years old the burden and obligations of fighting this war?

Mr. FIELDS. Will my colleague yield right there? Did not he state that the troubles in reference to recruiting in the British Army were based upon the fact they did not throw any safeguards around enlistments but took men in the army who had been in the munitions factories perhaps—

Mr. GORDON. Of course, that is true; the men sent back to munitions factories are volunteers, too.

Mr. FIELDS. Now, in connection with that we have provided these safeguards in our bill for the American volunteer.

Mr. GORDON. Yes; exactly the same as if we conscripted them. Now the gentleman says military experts advise the Commander in Chief. Yes; the military experts rejected territorial recruitment and the committee put it back in the bill. Do you know what territorial recruitment is? It is the proposition that those living in the same community may enlist together and go to the war together. A man wants to enlist and his younger brother also, and he can go to the front with him in the same company and take care of him. That originated in the Revolutionary War in 1776. That is the distinctive feature of the volunteer as against the conscript and standing army. It has since been adopted by every single nation in Europe and is in force to-day—the territorial recruitment proposition. That was rejected by the military advisers of the President and the committee had to put it back in the bill. There is no minority report on that proposition, however. The General Staff experts recommended that every bureau chief's salary be increased during the progress of this war and that they receive the pay and allowances of a major general—\$9,300 a year. We took that out also. [Laughter and applause.] Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter during the War of 1812, when this Nation was engaged in war with the greatest military and naval power on the face of the earth, in which he said that at some time in the future we ought to adopt the policy of military training for our youths.

You have not heard any utterance from Thomas Jefferson in favor of the minority proposition, however, and you will not.

Mr. Chairman, one of the changes in the bill submitted by the War Department was to strike out the provision authorizing the President to conscript by lot and selective draft into the

military service of the United States 500,000 men, and later the same number, if he found it necessary, from those of our citizens between the ages of 19 and 25, and to substitute therefor a provision authorizing a call forthwith by the President for 500,000 volunteers, and later a call for the same number, if necessary, from those of our citizens of military age.

The President is also authorized to provide for the registration of all our citizens between the ages of 21 and 40, inclusive. Upon completion of the registration, if the men authorized and called have not been raised by voluntary enlistment, the President is then authorized to conscript them by lot and selective draft from those citizens so registered.

Every citizen of common sense is able to decide for himself which of the two foregoing plans more nearly complies with the principle of universal liability to service; no one who has read it claims that the War Department bill contained any provision for "universal training." The nearest approach to this title was the provision stricken out, authorizing the conscription from those between 19 and 25 of the men required, for the period of the war, not to train, but to fight, and we concluded that men between 21 and 40 would be better for that purpose; and if the volunteers could be obtained they would, with the same preparation, make much better soldiers.

On March 26, 1917, The Adjutant General instructed the chiefs of the bureaus in the War Department to furnish emergency supplemental estimates of the amounts required for the organization of a volunteer army of 500,000 men, in addition to the Regular Army and National Guard, which organizations were to be recruited to a little over 500,000 more, and Congress has been asked to appropriate for this number for the coming year, and no more.

Just when it was decided by the War Department to abandon this intention to call for 500,000 volunteers does not appear in the testimony before our committee, or elsewhere that I know of, but it was sometime since these estimates were called for, as the men outside of the existing organizations are referred to in the hearings before our committee from April 7 to 17 as "additional troops."

The American volunteer, properly trained and disciplined, is the most effective soldier the world has ever seen, because he is the most intelligent and courageous, and because he always has fought for what he believed to be the cause of liberty; he has fought and won every war in which this Nation has engaged; and it was only in the Civil War that conscription was resorted to by Congress, and it then proved a ghastly failure; only 62,000 men out of over 2,200,000 were raised in the North by draft, and most of these deserted or ran away at the first shot.

We are at war with the greatest military power on earth. We can not afford to send conscripts against the trained legions of the Kaiser. If we had three or four years in which to train them, you might make an effective force with unwilling men in it, but the time is too short and we ought to have all volunteers, because they can be trained and conditioned more quickly and they are the most effective and dependable soldiers in the world.

We are advised by the Department of War that the registration and training of officers will take three to five months; why should not the President at once call for volunteers and accept them when he is ready to equip and train them, while the process of registration and training of officers is in progress?

It has been said in this debate that the minority desire to avoid having an army made up of part volunteers and part conscripts, and therefore they propose to permit men to volunteer in the Regular Army and National Guard, until the President orders a draft into these branches of the service, but that no one shall be permitted to volunteer for service in the new force created for the present emergency.

Will not this create and emphasize the very distinction and comparison which it is sought to avoid? The majority report places all three branches of the service on an exact equality and authorizes the President to resort to the draft to fill up each of them on the same terms and conditions.

In their efforts to discredit the volunteer principle it has been necessary to ignore and repudiate the rules and regulations which have always obtained in the Army and Navy of the United States. Men are not detailed to-day in the Regular service to the Aviation Corps, because it is too hazardous; they are required to volunteer. In all our wars where men have been asked to perform a specially dangerous duty, volunteers have been called for from men already in the service. When Hobson sunk the *Merrimac* in the harbor of Santiago in the Spanish War he and the men who went with him volunteered for that service. [Applause.]

The President can not lawfully send beyond the confines of the United States the National Guard until the members volunteer or are drafted for that special service. Both the President and Congress recognized that fact last summer, when Congress, at the request of the War Department, authorized the President to draft the National Guard, then on the border, for service in Mexico, in anticipation of an attack upon our Regular forces which were then beyond the border in pursuit of Villa. The authority conferred was not exercised by the President, because it did not become necessary, but both the President and Congress thereby recognized the legal status of the National Guard, which may only be lawfully called out by the President or Congress to suppress insurrection, repel invasion, or execute the laws of the United States.

The militia of the States, out of which is formed the Organized Militia, or National Guard, includes all citizens of military age.

When called by the President into the service of the United States during the War of 1812 some of the militia refused to cross the border for the conquest of Canada, and their right to so refuse was conceded. To what extent the United States Government can enlarge its powers over the militia, if at all, by "drafting" instead of "calling" them into the Federal service is doubtful.

So distinguished and able a constitutional lawyer as Daniel Webster contended on the floor of this House on December 9, 1814, that citizens of the States could not be drafted for an invasion of Canada or any other foreign country, and a conscription bill was defeated in the House at that time and for that reason, although we were then at war with England and had been for 2½ years.

The Judge Advocate General of the Army is reported to have ruled that Congress may draft into the military service the red-headed citizens only of the United States; this may possibly be true as a legal proposition, but no one would seriously consider doing such a thing.

Many have been misled into error as to the duty of Congress in this emergency by observing the operation of the military systems in Europe since the beginning of this war. For many years prior to the outbreak of the European war every country in Europe, except Great Britain, had compulsory military service; on their becoming of military age citizens and subjects of these countries automatically passed into military service for their terms provided by law, and on the expiration of these periods into the military reserve forces of their respective countries.

Upon the breaking out of the war, of course the young men then in active service were the ones first called to the front, and following these the men most recently in the service were called, reversing the order in which they had passed into the reserve. This was all done in accordance with previously existing law whereby these nations availed themselves of the services first of the citizens in active military service and called first those of the most recent and therefore the most effective military service and training.

But Congress can not properly apply this European system to the people of the United States in this crisis by drafting into the military service boys and young men between 19 and 25, and omitting those between 25 and 40. All in this country have had the same military training and experience between the ages of 19 and 40; there are no public reasons for discriminating against any class of our citizens of military age, or in favor of any, except that if the draft is to be applied it should not be exercised against minors who can not enter into a lawful contract except with the consent of their parents or guardians or by order of court.

I do not believe that any American citizen should be conscripted into the military service until he has first been afforded an opportunity to enlist. [Applause.] The English law, passed nearly two years after the war commenced, which puts men between 20 and 40 into the reserve, did not become operative against any Englishman until 30 days after the approval of the law and 30 days after young men to whom it applies arrive at military age. [Applause.]

Now, we have heard a good deal in this debate about slackers, and sulkers, and cowards, as well as in the newspapers. They are the men of which we want to make an army, we are told. If men would use just a little common sense they would know enough to know that cowards, and sulkers, and slackers do not make good soldiers. Take the experience of men in the Civil War, and they will tell you that most of those who were drafted deserted. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it not also true that when the tribunal sits in judgment on these boys from 19 to 25, some

of whom are registered as slackers and some of whom are brave boys, that the boy that volunteers will be found to have to take "his medicine" and is more likely to go than the slacker?

Mr. GORDON. That is true.

Mr. COX. I was interested in the gentleman's statement about the 62,000 men being conscripted in the Civil War. Will the gentleman tell where he got those figures?

Mr. GORDON. I obtained them from the best available authority. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] made a statement here on the floor of the House as to the number of them, and he gave it at 62,000. I obtained that from somebody, and I considered it entirely reliable.

Mr. LANGLEY. The report of the Commissioner of Pensions shows that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It was shown before the hearings on this very bill.

Mr. COX. The reason I ask is this, that I addressed a letter the other day to the Adjutant General of the Army, and while I have not got his letter here I think he said it was seven hundred and sixty thousand and odd that were conscripted during the Civil War. That is my recollection.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, no.

I quote from the annual report of the Secretary of War for 1865:

At the beginning of 1862, when recruiting was discontinued by the Secretary of War, there were 637,000 volunteers under arms, the surplus being turned away without record or pledge. The number of men raised in the North under act of March, 1863, was 1,369,343, but of these there were 1,076,558 volunteers under this enrollment act. The number of voluntary substitutes was 144,012, the number who escaped service by paying a fee was 86,724, and the number who were compelled personally to serve was 61,947. But 2.3 per cent of the total number of troops raised in the North from the beginning to the end of the war was raised by draft or conscription.

Mr. MEEKER. Where did he get his authority that most of them ran away at the first shot?

Mr. GORDON. Gen. Sherwood told me yesterday they sent him 72 conscripted men in the Atlanta campaign and that only 2 rendered any service at the front. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to ask the gentleman what he thinks would have been the result of that war if the northern Army had been composed of that character of men?

Mr. GORDON. The North never would have won the war.

Mr. CRAGO. Would the majority of those conscripts ever have tried to be volunteers in any case?

Mr. GORDON. I do not know. Capt. Benson says that there is not a particle of difference in England to-day between the men who came in under compulsion and those that volunteer.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman thinks, then, that the English conscript is more constant in his service than the American?

Mr. GORDON. I will tell you what I think about that. The English conscription act is a very much more sensible proposition than the one proposed by the General Staff. [Laughter.] It gives every man an opportunity to volunteer, but 30 days after he becomes of age he becomes amenable to the law and passes into the reserve. So he is afforded an opportunity to volunteer. I think a provision like that would help some in this bill. Now, I want to know if this Congress of the United States can go out and look in the faces of these boys between 19 and 25 after it has voted to conscript them into the Army to the exclusion of everybody above 25 years of age? This Congress will cover itself all over with infamy as with a garment if it ever dares to enact such a law as that. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. GORDON. Now, a great deal of mystery has been thrown into this discussion by the gentlemen here, though I do not say intentionally. But they have ascribed to the volunteer system things that are not peculiar to that system at all. The Secretary of War, who has a letter embodied in the minority report of our committee, is an artist in the use of words, and I want you to just go and read the reasons that he gives there against permitting men to volunteer. He points out objections that are not peculiar to the volunteer system. Tell me why you can not assign a man to a munition factory who has volunteered just as well as one who is conscripted? There is not a thing in that argument at all. They have undertaken to discredit the volunteer soldier, and why men would seek to do that in the light of history is something that passes my comprehension. Why, they talk about the volunteers in the War of 1812, when this Capital was captured, but they never tell you that in the War of 1812 four States in New England refused to furnish a man or a dollar to prosecute that war. [Applause.] They do not tell you that the State of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut refused to allow their troops to fight in that war. [Applause.] They ascribe it all

to the volunteers. The trouble with that war was that the New England States did not volunteer. That was the trouble.

Mr. CRAGO. Under the plan proposed here these States could not refuse to furnish their proper number, could they?

Mr. GORDON. No. You could conscript them, but what good would they be after you conscripted them?

I want you to look at this thing as a common-sense proposition. We are in to win this war. The adoption of this draft at the outset looks like an indictment of every man that voted for this declaration of war. I voted for it and I did it conscientiously. I believe every word that was stated in that declaration of war, and I believe the American people will sustain the Congress and the President in the prosecution of this war.

If it is necessary I am ready to go back to my district and tell them why I voted for this resolution, and why the war ought to be vigorously prosecuted, but I do not want to clap the draft onto them the very first thing before I go home. [Laughter.] We want an efficient Army. I do not see how men can reason it out that you can take reluctant soldiers, when you may not have more than eight or nine months to train them, and assemble them into an effective army. I do not know how that could be done. We might be attacked. We have been told here by the General Staff and by military experts how many soldiers Germany could land here within a certain time. Of course, I never believed any such stuff as that. [Laughter.] But still if they believed everything they said, we ought to get ready for an invasion in case they settled the war over in Europe. We need these men. We are at war with the greatest military power on earth, but we are made to understand that we have nothing here to fight with but slackers. The German soldiers have taken compulsory military service with their mother's milk. They are accustomed to it. It does not work the harm and demoralization in those European countries that it would work here. But the American citizen is not accustomed to that sort of thing. He is used to fighting when he wants to fight. [Applause.] I think that as a matter of policy it is a very unwise thing to adopt this thing at the start, and I think it comes with very poor grace, if I may be allowed to say so, from the minority of the committee to criticize us for trying, as we did, to stand by the President, when we put in their own draft proposition as an alternative after having provided in the bill an opportunity for voluntary enlistment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And in line with that, the gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] criticized us for putting the draft system in there as a means of driving men to volunteer. Is it not a fact that the general law now holds open the same system for a part of the Regular Army?

Mr. GORDON. I believe that is the fact, so that there is nothing in that argument. Oh, so many things are said to be known in this debate that are not so that it is really amusing. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe it will be possible to recruit this Army without resorting to conscription?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; I do.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, why put the conscription measure in your bill?

Mr. GORDON. Because you say we can not get the army without conscription, and the military experts say we can not; and we say we do not want to delay the President in the prosecution of the war a minute, and therefore, out of deference to the views of the War Department and the General Staff, we give you that machinery, and while building the machinery we give the American citizen a chance to volunteer. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it because the majority of the committee does not want to assume the responsibility, and you are putting that feature in your bill so as to have something to stand behind? [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Oh, not at all. I will say to the gentleman that it was my preference to put up a straight volunteer proposition first.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was the thing to do.

Mr. GORDON. But some of my colleagues in whom I have great confidence decided otherwise, and I decided to go with them. Now, you may criticize us for following the President too far. But it does not rest in your mouth to say that we ought to pass this bill in accordance with the War Department's recommendations while closing our eyes and ears and without having read it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have touched upon most of the points I desired to make, and I thank the House for its courtesy. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman returns four minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it has been stated in the public press, and perhaps to a certain extent justly, that I have been on all sides of this question. In the Sixty-fourth Congress I was known as the big-army Democrat. I offered an amendment providing for universal training for American youth to the military appropriation bill that year, and in this Congress I introduced the Chamberlain bill in the House—H. R. 19.

In committee I have insisted that provision should be made in this bill to take in all the men of military age above 26 who have had military training in this or some other country who can be spared from their civil pursuits, and who would be glad to volunteer for this emergency if they could do so without joining the Regulars or the National Guard.

If I have committed a breach of my duty in thinking out loud, then, of course, I must suffer the consequences. But I hope that I never reach the point where I become stubborn. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I have felt that it was my duty to thrash out any line of argument which my point of view yesterday, to-day, or to-morrow might suggest to my mind. If you will read the hearings you will find that I have earnestly and conscientiously endeavored to do that duty.

That work has been done I hope satisfactorily. We are now before this House with a bill, asking the Members of this House to make up their minds how much of that bill they will pass. We should not resort to any flights of oratory. We should not appeal to sympathy. We should not be too closely bound to tradition. We are living in the present, and this question must be discussed in the cold light of existing facts. We must be governed not by any criticism in the press, not by propaganda pro-English nor pro-German, not by the demands of those who pose as leaders of patriotic movements, but who fear that public sentiment may demand that they enlist, but by calm, sober judgment.

The statement has been made here that we need a willing army to begin the war, and that the only way to get a willing army is to call for willing men, but the answer comes back that when you draft American men you are going to have an army willing to fight anywhere to defend this Nation. [Applause.]

One of the most serious objections that I found to this proposition when it came before the committee was this: There are over 100,000 men in the United States of military age, who to a large extent would not go into the Regular Establishment nor the National Guard, and who would be glad to join the new army, but who would not be given an opportunity under the draft provision for the increased forces, because they were over the age to be called. It seemed to me that here, when we were about to organize an army we ought to place in the hands of the President the power to receive the services of all of these willing men who had been trained in Italy, Switzerland, Australia, or this or in any other country, where they have a military establishment, and who have made their home under the protection of the Stars and Stripes. I have felt that those men should have the opportunity to go in and fight for the country that they have made their home, and love for the liberty and happiness it insures. [Applause.] I felt that so long as it was possible to open that door, it was my duty as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs to demand that the door be opened, because I recognized that these men who had seen that kind of service might refuse to go into the Regular Army or the National Guard, and I wanted them to be among the first trained, for we will need trained men as noncoms in this war. I insisted upon it with all the power that is in me, and I insisted on it in the face of criticism from nearly every daily paper in the United States, aided and abetted by those who do not understand the issue here, those who have a selfish purpose, and those that seek to injure me. I would insist on it now, if it were not for the fact that I feel that I can trust the wisdom of the President and realize that a greater injury may be done the country through disagreement, dissension, or delay, and I thank those friends that have given me their counsel.

I hope that I now demonstrate that I have not confused stubbornness with firmness, and I pray that I never shall be so small as to adopt a policy that I alone can be right.

This is the day to get ready to fight the battles of that great war that we have declared against the despots of the world,

and we can not delay. You ask, "If this is the condition"—and it is a fact admitted by the Secretary of War in his testimony before this committee—"why is it that the President refuses to open that door and receive the services of these men who can be spared from the industrial life of the country, men who are not married, men who have no dependents, men who perhaps have enough of this world's goods so that they can go away and come back again, or perhaps never come back again, without leaving anyone destitute? Why does the President of the United States refuse to accept the services of these men?"

I have tried to find the answer, and I believe I have found it, not in the record, not in anything that anyone has testified to before that committee, but in the facts that are known to us all.

In the national-defense act it is provided that the Regular Army may be raised to 287,000 men, and the Secretary has admitted that the War Department is going to raise it to that number. It is provided that in the event they do not get those men by voluntary enlistments they can draft them, and the Secretary intimates that they are going to do that. In that same act it provides that the National Guard may be raised to 641,000 men as a minimum, and the Secretary has admitted that he is going to call them. It is provided that when those men are carried away under the drafting provision of section 111 new battalions may be formed under section 79, and if those battalions are not created as fast as required, they, too, can be drafted from the unorganized militia, and the Secretary has admitted that they are going to get them. When you add them all together you find you have practically a million men. Follow me. Already in the law of this land, without the passing of a single statute, we have now the means of raising an army in time of war of a million men, and we are in war. The President wants an army, and how many does he want? Do not look at the words in the bill authorizing the number. Look to see what money he asks for. He has asked for three thousand million dollars, \$3,000,000,000. The department has brought to this committee a detailed statement showing how it is going to be spent. They say it will provide for only 1,000,000 men; no more. Then why this provision for the other million men by conscription? The national-defense act in section 111 fixes the National Guard at 641,000 men in time of war as a minimum, not as a maximum. By the use of that statute they can pump into the American Army every able-bodied man in America between the ages of 18 and 45. Why does he want this power of conscription separate and apart? The answer is plain, when you once think of it. We have entered into a war to the like of which the history of the world has never shown a parallel.

When is it going to stop? Will 1,000,000 men do it, or 2,000,000, or 5,000,000, or 7,000,000? What Member of this House has heard any news from the battle line on the Russian frontier since war was declared by us? We have military observers in Russia, and their reports are coming by wireless through a censorship, and which of you has been able to find a single word as to what is going on there? Why does the President ask for this unreasonable thing? Why does he demand the power to draft a million men when he is not going to use them? Because undoubtedly there are indications that this war is not going to be disposed of in a little while; because, my friends, it probably appears to the President that there is a possibility that the manhood of America has got to take the place of the Russian soldier and carry our flag to Berlin and put down the Kaiser and his barbarism. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman mean to state that the President has any such information, or is the gentleman just guessing at it?

Mr. CALDWELL. Guessing.

Mr. DENISON. Just guessing?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes. If you can show any other reasonable ground on which the President of the United States, in this great crisis in America, would take issue with this representative body of the people and demand that this shall be written thus far and no farther, that he can not fight this war that we have agreed with him is just unless he has that kind of machinery, I shall be glad to hear any other reason. Gentlemen, I have followed the President in the past when I thought he was wrong, because I saw the possibility that he was right. To-day I see the possibility that this far-sighted, calm, peaceful man sees this thing, and for myself, I propose to vote with him on this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Just for a question.

Mr. SANFORD. I want to understand the gentleman. Do I understand that the gentleman from New York is supporting the majority report or the minority report?

Mr. CALDWELL. My report. It is as follows:

[House of Representatives, Rept. 17, pt. 3, 65th Cong., 1st sess.]
INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Minority views by Mr. CALDWELL, to accompany H. R. 3545:
I am in favor of the draft feature of this bill, and feel that it should be put in operation at the earliest possible moment. The words "draft" and "conscription" have come to have an odium given to them by the unfortunate use of the draft method only after a sufficient force could not be obtained to meet the requirements by volunteer enlistment. No such odium will attach if the draft is put into operation while the volunteers are coming in large numbers.

The bill makes it necessary to try out the volunteer system or declare it a failure before the draft can be put into operation. The volunteer provision is permissive only, but it leaves no other course open to raise the army we need now until volunteering has been tried and found unsatisfactory.

There is a large number of men of military age who have had military training in this or some other country who can be spared from their civil pursuits and who would be glad to volunteer for this emergency if they could do so without joining the Regulars or the National Guard. The bill will close the doors to these men if they are above the age of the selection (probably 26) and result in the loss of their services in the military arm, but this will not be as serious a loss as would come through delay, dissension, or division.

I have pressed this view upon the Secretary of War and upon the President, and my only answer has been that they thought that the situation could be best met by confining the volunteers to the Regulars and the National Guard.

There is much force in the argument that it is traditional with the English-speaking race to fight its wars with volunteers; that we should start our wars with a willing army, and that each individual was best able to judge for himself what particular line of endeavor he should best pursue in the defense of his country. But this is no ordinary war and should be approached with the hope that it will not last long, but with the intention of providing for the worst that could happen, namely, a long war, so therefore conscription at the outset is the logical answer.

Under the circumstances and because of the delay that must necessarily occur in the final passage of the bill carrying any kind of a provision recognizing volunteers, I am constrained to believe that the best interests of the country will be subserved by striking from the bill the provision of subdivision third of section 1, authorizing the President to call for volunteers, and the proviso accompanying same.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAS. POPE CALDWELL.

APRIL 21, 1917.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to ask the gentleman a question or two about the National Guard. I understood the gentleman to say that the machinery is now in operation by which the minimum number of National Guardsmen who may be drawn into the service is a million men.

Mr. CALDWELL. No; 641,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Does the gentleman know how many men they have now in the National Guard under the volunteer system?

Mr. CALDWELL. I can give it to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to get that information.

Mr. KAHN. I can inform the gentleman. About 10 days ago they had 120,000 men.

Mr. HOWARD. One other question. Under the bill proposed by the administration these avenues for volunteer enlistment—that is, in the Regular Army and the National Guard—will be left open, as I understand it, for volunteer enlistments.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. That will cover 650,000 men.

Mr. CALDWELL. When the Regular Establishment is carried up to the limit there will be 287,000 men. There are at present 137,000 men.

Mr. HOWARD. I hold a letter in my hand from the President, in which he uses this language:

Those who feel we are turning away altogether from the voluntary principle seem to forget that some 600,000 men will be needed to fill the ranks of the Regular Army and the National Guard, and that very great field of individual enthusiasm lies there wide open.

Mr. DENT. On page 216 of the hearings the Secretary of War gives the National Guard as 357,000 men. They now have 266,000. There is a deficit between what can volunteer and what we have now in the Regular Army of 623,000 men.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, yesterday a Member on this side of the House asked what wars, or what battles, members of the General Staff had fought in. I have taken the trouble to look up the record, and I find the following:

LIST OF OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL STAFF CORPS ON DUTY IN WASHINGTON, D. C., AND BATTLES OR ENGAGEMENTS IN WHICH THEY PARTICIPATED.

NAMES AND BATTLES, ETC.

Maj. Gen. H. L. Scott: Expedition against Sioux Indians, 1876; Nez Percés expedition, 1878; Crow expedition, 1883; Cattalubunka, P. I., November 14, 1903, in which action was wounded; engagement with Moro Chief Hassan, February 14, 1904; second Sulu expedition, November 11 to December 1, 1903; third Sulu expedition, May 1 to 12, 1905; Looc, P. I., January 7, 1905.

Maj. Gen. T. H. Bliss: Coamo, P. R., August 9, 1898; Albonito, P. R., August 19, 1898; Bud Dajo, P. I., March 5 to 8, 1906.

Maj. Gen. E. M. Weaver: None.

Brig. Gen. W. A. Mann: El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; Santiago, Cuba, July 10 and 11, 1898; San Luis, Luzon, P. I., May 17, 1899; San Fernando, P. I., May 25, 1899; San Blas, P. I., November 20, 1899; Passi, P. I., November 26, 1899; Romblon, P. I., December 16, 1899.

Brig. Gen. J. E. Kuhn: None.

Col. C. W. Kennedy: El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; Santiago, Cuba, July 10 and 11, 1898.

Col. W. H. Johnston: Guanica, P. R., July 25 and 26, 1898; San Fernando, P. I., August 9, 1899; Porac, P. I., September 28, 1899; Angeles, P. I., October 11 and 12, 1899; Pandacanqui and Magalang, P. I., November 12, 1899; Bamban, P. I., November 12, 1899; Rivera de San Fernando, P. I., December 7, 1899; Botolan, P. I., December 8, 1899; Iba, P. I., December 9, 1899; Silang, P. I., January 7, 1900; Calaca, P. I., January 18, 1900; Taal, P. I., January 19, 1900; Matnog, P. I., December 19, 1900; Mongbong, P. I., January 25, 1906; Magton, P. I., March 23, 1906.

Col. R. E. L. Michie: None.

Col. P. D. Lochridge: None.

Col. G. B. Duncan: Santiago, Cuba, July 10 to 17, 1898; Guanica, P. R., July 24, 1898; La Loma Church, P. I., March 25, 1899; Marquina and Rio Nancá, about March 31, 1899; Marquina and Antipolo and Merong, between June 2 and 8, 1899; Guadalupe Ridge, June 10, 1899; Block House No. 5, Manila, P. I., October 9, 1899; Anabo, P. I., January, 1901; Salitran, P. I., February 22, 1901; Pulongbunga, P. I., March, 1901; Majada, P. I., July 2, 1901.

Lieut. Col. W. S. Graves: Amara, Ilocos Sur, P. I., February 11, 1901; Alaludig, P. I., March 21, 1901; Sibugnay, P. I., March 30, 1901; Lueguos, P. I., April 9, 1901; San Emello, P. I., small engagements in Ilocos Sur, P. I., February 12, March 8 to 29, and in Batangas Province, P. I., between July 19, 1901, and February 1, 1902; Caloccan, December 21, 1901.

Maj. Andrew Moses: None.

Maj. G. A. Nugent: None.

Maj. P. E. Pierce: Coamo, P. R., August 14, 1898; Albonito, P. R., August 19, 1898; Guadalupe Ridge, P. I., June 10, 1899; Cavite Viejo, P. I., October 8, 1899; Rosario, P. I., October 9, 1899; San Francisco de Malabon, P. I., October 10, 1899; San Fabian, P. I., November 7, 1899; Rabon River and Santo Thomas, P. I., November 14, 1899.

Maj. R. H. Van Deman: San Blas, P. I., November 15, 1899; Janiway, P. I., November 18, 1899; Passi, P. I., November 25, 1899; Dumarao, P. I., December 1, 1899; Antique, P. I., January 10, 1899.

Maj. J. MacA. Palmer: None.

Maj. Douglas MacArthur: None.

Maj. F. S. Cocheu: El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; San Juan Hills, July 2, 3, 10, and 11, 1898; Calulut, P. I., August 9, 1899; Angeles, P. I., August 16, 1899; August 19, 1899; Bamban, P. I., November 11, 1899; Monte Paruyan, P. I., June 21, 1900; Uguis, P. I., June 30, 1900; Monte Paruyan, P. I., August 1, 1900; Badoc, P. I., August 29, 1900; between Currimao and Radoc, P. I., September 6, 1900; Radoc, P. I., September 13, 1900.

Maj. B. H. Wells: Santiago, Cuba, July 1 and 2, 1898, wounded on later date; Iloilo, P. I., February 11, 1899; Jaro, P. I., February 12, 1899; near Jaro and Pavia, P. I., February 14, March 1, and 16, 1899.

Maj. D. E. Nolan: Point Arbolitos, Cuba, May, 1898; El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; siege of Santiago, July 2 to 17, 1898; San Pedro Macati, P. I., June 10, 1899; Anabo, P. I., November 18, 1899; San Mateo, P. I., December 19, 1899; Montalban, P. I., December 27, 1899; Silang, P. I., January 7, 1900; Indang, P. I., January 7, 1900; Naic, P. I., January 9, 1900; San Pablo, P. I., January 14, 1900; Sarlaya, P. I., January 20, 1900.

Maj. D. T. Moore: Participated in a number of expeditions in the Provinces of Cavite and Laguna, P. I., from September, 1900, to March 16, 1901.

Maj. J. J. Kingman: None.

Capt. Tenney Ross: Engagement with Chippewa Indians at Leech Lake, Minn., October 5, 1898; expedition ending with fall of Malolos, P. I., Mar. 18, 1899; expedition in Luzon, P. I., April to June, 1899; in number of minor actions in Philippine Islands between June, 1899, and March, 1902.

Capt. W. H. Raymond: Pinauran, P. I., November 22, 1900.

Capt. D. F. Craig: Bacolor and San Antonio, P. I., August 9, 1899; Santa Rita, P. I., August 19, 1899; San Antonio, P. I., September 9, 1899; Porac, P. I., September 28, 1899; Dolores and Porac, P. I., October 17, 1899; Mabalacat, P. I., November 7 and 8, 1899; Bamban, P. I., November 11, 1899; Mangataram, P. I., November 28, 1899; Balincaguig, P. I., January 22, 1900; Oato Forts, P. I., October 24, 1904.

Capt. H. N. Coates: Baliuag, P. I., June 8, 1900; Blac na Bata Pass, P. I., September 15, 1900; San Miguel de Mayumo, P. I., October 9 and 13, 1900; Kinnihitang, P. I., November 10, 1903; Candaba Swamp expedition, June 21, 1900.

Capt. A. B. Cox: San Cristobal River, P. I., January 1, 1900; Cabuyao, P. I., January 1, 1900; Binan, P. I., January 2, 1900; Carmona, P. I., January 3, 1900; Luta, P. I., January 3, 1900; skirmishes at Rosario, P. I., May 6, 1900; Darosa, P. I., June 25, 1900; Bagumbayan, P. I., September 2, 1900; and Iba, P. I., February 9, 1901.

The ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE, April 24, 1917.

So that the military attainments of men in the Military Establishment of this country is as great as could be expected.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. COX. What is the maximum number of men that can be recruited for the National Guard under the act of last year?

Mr. CALDWELL. Six hundred and forty-one thousand men.

Mr. COX. I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that that was the minimum number.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is the minimum number.

Mr. COX. What is the maximum?

Mr. CALDWELL. As many males as there are in the United States between the ages of 18 and 45.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. The gentleman stated that he had often voted with the President in the past when he thought he was wrong, believing that by possibility the President might be right.

Mr. CALDWELL. The probability that he might be right.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Is the gentleman going to support the minority report on the basis of the request of the President or upon his own conviction?

Mr. CALDWELL. My position is this: I can see that the army we now need could be raised without the existence of conscription, but because I see the large probability that an army that we may need or will need can not be so raised, I believe it is desirable at this time to establish conscription before the odium attaches to it. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that the War Department has convinced the gentleman that the entire burden of this war, so far as new units are concerned, shall be placed on the shoulders of boys from 19 to 25 years of age, as insisted on by the War Department?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; it has not.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman is only following the President and the War Department a part of the way?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; if the gentleman wants to put it that way, but I will say for his information that the Secretary of War has yielded on that point.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, if the gentleman will be good enough to yield further. The gentleman referred in an answer to a question about the opportunity for enlistment in the Regular Army and the National Guard. The gentleman understands that the Regular Establishment does not invite the ordinary volunteer. Now, as to the National Guard, is it not true that a large proportion of the opportunities there are in new units, and if they should be received at this time 20 States stand ready to furnish new volunteer units to the National Guard which the War Department will not accept but has refused?

Mr. CALDWELL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. On April 5, 1917, the Secretary of War sent out an order in which he directed the adjutant generals of the various States to cease organizing the new bodies of men in their States as a part of the National Guard. In our committee that order was taken up and discussed. After considerable discussion, and I might say pressure, at my request the Secretary of War asked the Judge Advocate General for an opinion as to whether or not he had the authority to issue that order. A few days after that the Judge Advocate General wrote an opinion in which he said that the Secretary of War did not have that authority, and I understand that since that time the Secretary of War has directed the adjutant generals throughout the United States, in those National Guard organizations, to increase their organizations up to 800 per Representative in Congress, House and Senate.

Mr. DENT. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that; he has directed them just the other way.

Mr. CALDWELL. I was so informed.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me say, for information, that I saw a letter in the hands of a Member of the House from the adjutant general of one of the States of this Union stating specifically that the War Department had not called on them for new units, and they were ready to furnish them.

Mr. CALDWELL. Let me say that I called the Secretary of War's attention to that fact and he told me that he had sent letters to every person who had theretofore made an inquiry about it, but he did not feel that it was necessary to send it to those States where no objection had been raised.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the statement made by the gentleman about the purpose of a large army—that is, the probability of a separate peace with Russia. Does the gentleman think that the President had any such condition in mind at the time he advocated the selective draft system?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no knowledge on the subject whatever, but I do say this, that as a Member of this House I am not going to stand between him and the care of such situation if it does happen, and I fear that it may happen. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the House, I desire to preface my remarks with a reference to efforts which have been made to put forth a propaganda in this country to improperly influence the votes of Members of this body upon the pending legislation. As a sample of the methods which are being used to artificially stir up sentiment in the country, I desire to read to the House a telegram sent to me by a friend in my district:

The following telegram came in to-night: "New York, N. Y., April 16, 1917. The Secretary Chamber of Commerce (of a town in Kansas):

Representative ANTHONY, of your district, is reported opposed to universal military service and blocking President Wilson in his fight against Germany. We suggest you organize mass meetings in your district to show Representative ANTHONY that Americans who sent him to Congress demand that he support President Wilson and universal military training. Please arouse local interests and enlist strong newspaper support for this campaign. Please advise us at once, by wire, of your willingness to fight. American Defense Society, 303 Fifth Avenue, New York."

Then, as a comment on the telegram which I have just read, are these words:

No attention will be paid to this here. Congressmen may want to know, however, what methods are being used to work up sentiment by this defense society.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to say that the statements that are made in this telegram reflecting on the loyalty of Members of this body that have been sent into my district and into yours are contemptible lies, and I want to brand the lying insinuation in reference to myself as a most miserable falsehood, and my district, I believe, knows it to be such. Such charges are beneath contempt, were it not that some people uninformed might be misled. [Applause.] But I believe it would be fitting and proper at some future time for this House to inquire into the motives of some of those New York gentlemen who belong to these bogus defense societies, and who are sending such telegrams abroad in the land to attempt to intimidate Members of Congress and prevent them from voting their honest sentiments. [Applause.]

I believe it would show that many of the members of some of these societies—at least the members of the society that paid \$53 for sending nearly 100 telegrams to me from one town—would be found to be stockholders in munition plants or speculators in the bonds of the countries now at war. [Applause.] So much for that.

I desire to speak directly to the pending bill. In my judgment, if this country were really confronted by a situation which menaced us with an immediate invasion by some foreign power, I would say that the bill which has been sent from the War Department to the Military Committee of the House, and which is being supported by the minority of our committee today in this body, would represent little short of criminal negligence in not properly and at the earliest moment placing this country in a proper state of defense against a foreign foe. As I saw it, and as a majority of the Committee on Military Affairs see it, to wait six months—and in my opinion it will take six months before the machinery of conscription can be installed and placed in working order and the first conscripts sent into the training camps—to wait that long to organize the additional army of half a million men that the President asks for would be little short of criminal negligence in a critical situation. Therefore we are providing the machinery for immediately raising an additional army of 500,000 volunteers, which, gentlemen, can be placed in the training camps within 30 days, and at the end of the 3 months' time, which the Secretary of War himself admits will be the shortest time in which the machinery of conscription can be placed in operation, we will have this army of half a million men either in process of training or practically trained and ready for any emergency that may confront us.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Did not the Secretary of War also state that he would not be able to equip volunteers inside of six months, to give them the necessary training?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the Secretary made that statement and I considered that he was not warranted in making it. The Secretary stated that he could not take care of the training and equipment of an army of half a million volunteers in three months' time for the reason that he did not have the equipment. I reminded the Secretary of War that he did have the guns and that he could start the training of an army of half a million men as soon as he could put the guns in their hands, and that this country could within 30 days furnish uniforms and equipment, and I believe I am absolutely correct in my position. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ANTHONY. For a question.

Mr. BORLAND. In my recollection, we have 800,000 Springfield rifles?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. BORLAND. And about 300,000 Kraggs?

Mr. ANTHONY. Three hundred and fifty thousand Kraggs.

Mr. BORLAND. A little more than 1,100,000 rifles, and my recollection is that the Regular Army, if recruited up to its full force, would make nearly 300,000 men, and the National Guard 625,000 more, and would not that practically absorb not only all of your volunteers, but all of your guns?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will state to the gentleman, that while I do not say it with absolute certainty, yet I believe it to be a fact, that the War Department has placed a contract for 1,000,000 Enfield rifles, the rifles used by the English Government—chambered for American ammunition which will be delivered perhaps within 60 days.

Mr. BORLAND. Deliver 1,000,000 rifles in 60 days?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. That is certainly news to this House.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know it to be a fact, but I believe they will be.

Mr. BORLAND. That is certainly news to this House.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will state to the gentleman that the great plant at Eddystone, Del., owned by the Baldwin Locomotive Works, has completed its contracts for furnishing rifles to the English Government and the Russian Government and we were told over six weeks ago by the president of that company, Mr. Vauclain, that he stood ready immediately to commence turning out rifles for the American Army, and our committee has been informed by officials of the War Department that such a contract has already been placed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not true our plants, arsenals, and such others as we might use—private plants which we may be able to contract with—in addition to the Eddystone Co., have speeded up in their output?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that is the case, and I will say to the gentleman in reference to private plants for the manufacture of small arms in this country that their capacity is practically unlimited at the present time. There is no question about equipment of small arms for any army no matter how large.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We have heretofore given contracts with the idea to some extent of keeping them alive and in order to have some competition.

Mr. ANTHONY. Quite true.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman recall that Mr. Vauclain told a number of the members of our committee that the full capacity, if it reached full capacity, for the manufacture of the Enfield rifle was only 6,000 a day?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not remember the exact figures, but the gentleman will agree with me in regard to the small-arms situation in this country that there is no trouble about the acquisition of small arms.

Mr. TILSON. It is the most serious trouble of all we are facing to-day, the trouble of small arms, and they are the most difficult arms to supply.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is an important item here. The gentleman across the aisle [Mr. BUTLER], a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, said that that plant was furnishing 7,500 a day.

Mr. BUTLER. Seven thousand five hundred, and furthermore it will furnish 15,000 rifles a day.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the bill reported by the majority of the Military Committee because, in my judgment, it will give to the country, if its authorizations are faithfully carried out, the most effective Army possible of creation, and that in the shortest time.

The bill gives to the President all that he has asked for in the way of authority to enroll the men of the Nation of proper military age and to draft or conscript them into the armies of the United States should he deem it advisable, predicated, however, upon the failure of sufficient response to the call for volunteers which is the first authorization given to the President in the bill, although under its provisions all the machinery of the proposed draft is immediately put to work and can be utilized if it becomes necessary to do so.

But the measure brought before the Military Committee of this House by the Secretary of War with the approval of the President and which has received the indorsement of only a minority of the committee, if enacted into law in its present shape, would lay this Congress open to the charge of not having done its full duty to the country if the emergency which confronts us and the military menace from a foreign foe is as great as some think it to be.

Mr. Chairman, I make the broad statement that if the President is compelled to rely solely upon the legislation which the minority has indorsed to furnish the men for the proposed additional army of half a million men that it will be six months before the first conscripts will begin to filter into the training camps if we are compelled to wait for the months to elapse and the time to be consumed in setting up the complicated machinery of the conscription and completing the enrollment and exemptions of the men of the Nation eligible for military duty.

The Secretary of War when he appeared before our committee stated in answer to my question that it would take not less than three months to do this work. My own opinion is that it will waste nearer six months of valuable time.

I believe that it will be inexcusable negligence to defer the organization of this new army of one-half million men which the President desires, in addition to the 287,000 men of the Regular Army at war strength, and the 440,000 men of the National Guard at war strength also authorized by this bill, until next summer or next fall, as would be the case if sole reliance was placed on the conscripts to be secured by this measure.

If the country wants immediate military preparedness, and I believe it does; if this Congress wants to put this new army of one-half million men at once into training, and I for one certainly want it created at the earliest possible moment, the one way to get it now, and the one American way, is to give this authorization to the President to make an immediate call for half a million volunteers as we have provided.

If you will do this, there is not the slightest doubt that every State will furnish its full quota, and even before the time the machinery of an obnoxious draft is in working order a splendid army of American volunteers in process of training, if not fully trained, will be ready awaiting the President's command. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the only difference between the advocates of the respective measures is as to the quickest and best way of raising an army that can win this war?

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely. I will say to the gentleman the majority of the committee is going further in putting the country in a state of preparedness than the minority or the bill the War Department provides.

Mr. POUL. There is no division of opinion that an army sufficient to do the business ought to be raised?

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely not; only I believe the majority is going further toward that end than the minority.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, I challenge the correctness of that statement, and in my own time will show it is incorrect.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be glad to hear the gentleman prove his statement to be correct, and if he can show that providing this country with half a million volunteers within 30 days and having them in training is not putting this country in a better state of preparedness than to wait six months for half a million conscripts I will acknowledge my mistake. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield further? The gentleman understands that the machinery for getting the conscripts goes into operation, according to the Secretary of War, in not over three months.

Mr. ANTHONY. Goes into operation at once, as is provided by our bill, but it will not be completed.

Mr. KAHN. To complete the registration will take about three months.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is what he says, but I believe it will take six months to have it all in good working order.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman is entirely in error. The plans are already drawn by the War Department to put the machine into operation as soon as this bill is signed.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will bet the gentleman a new hat there is not a conscript placed in the training camps inside of three months in this country.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BATHRICK. Does not the gentleman understand, or is it correct for me to understand, that we have power now to secure through volunteers over 600,000 men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that this proposition of individuals "volunteering" for service in the Regular Army or National Guard, as the country understands the word "volunteer," is a delusion, a snare, and a fraud. There is no opportunity being offered by the War Department, as the minority say is being offered, for the organization of volunteers by the War Department. An individual has the right to enlist in the Regular Army now as he always had, but American boys do not regard that as serving their country in a volunteer Army by any means. [Applause.]

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, is it not a fact that the War Department has issued an order that those volunteering under the present law can volunteer for service during the war?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is true they will be permitted to enlist for the war.

Mr. BATHRICK. Not for the seven years or four years?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. BATHRICK. Then why are we not this moment placed upon the same plane as we will be after the bill is passed?

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that a volunteer army, as an American volunteer army is constituted, is raised in units—

Mr. BATHRICK. I understand.

Mr. ANTHONY. In the States by regiments, in localities by company units, with the pride of the State behind the regiment and with the pride of the community behind the company. That is the secret of the success of an American volunteer army, and that is why the American boy will gladly enlist in such an army.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, I concede that, and I want to ask the gentleman one question more for information. The men who are volunteering now, do they not volunteer in the National Guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; they enlist in the Regular Army or the National Guard. There is no question of volunteering about it.

Mr. BATHRICK. They got their services without conscription?

Mr. ANTHONY. The word "volunteer" in such a case is a misnomer and ought to be so understood by the House.

Mr. BATHRICK. It is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like to have the gentleman state to the House whether or not any plans have been formulated for taking this military census that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] refers to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Perhaps the department has formulated such a plan and perhaps it has not.

Mr. TOWNER. Are we to understand the War Department expects to take a census of the country for military purposes?

Mr. ANTHONY. Unquestionably that is the purpose. They will do so under regulations which our bill authorizes them to draw up.

Mr. TOWNER. If that is the case, what machinery has the War Department for doing it?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under this bill the War Department proposes to take advantage of the machinery which exists in the civil departments of the Government and by use of local officials and agencies to take such a census of the men of military age in this country.

Mr. TOWNER. And, in your judgment, it would take six months to do this?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not merely to complete the census or registration; but it probably would to perfect all the machinery of the draft and have it in successful operation.

Mr. AYRES. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I want to inquire if under the present arrangement in each congressional district 800 men are not permitted to enlist or volunteer in the National Guard or Regular Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the maximum under the law now permitted for the National Guard.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that in the State of Kansas over 80 per cent have already registered and volunteered?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true, if the gentleman means that Kansas has furnished already that proportion of the number of recruits needed to bring the Regular Army to war strength, according to our population.

Mr. AYRES. While in Illinois only about 18 per cent, in the State of Missouri 12 per cent, and in the Eastern States 10 to 15 per cent?

Mr. ANTHONY. And as a further jewel in the crown of the Sunflower State, let me say to the gentleman that Kansas has already more than furnished her quota of men for the United States Navy to-day [applause], and that the State of Massachusetts, whose Representatives on this floor are unanimous and strongest for conscription, is away short of its quota for both the United States Army and the United States Navy.

Mr. AYRES. Then I would like to ask my colleague if it is not a good argument for conscription in order to get these Eastern States in the service?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that a conscript is not a real soldier; that any soldier whose legs are chained to the wheels of his cannon never can be depended upon to fight a battle.

Mr. LANGLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman that on that question of census taking the civil officers over the country are as a rule not experts in that line of work. The greatest difficulty the Census Office has always had is to get experts to do that work, and they have never been able to get the work done within the time mapped out to do it.

Mr. ANTHONY. In this case it will undoubtedly be made compulsory upon the individual to report his own eligibility as well, so it will not take as long as a regular census.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. In opening your address you made a statement as to certain telegrams from New York organizations, and made certain references, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Can he tell this House whether or not the Chamber of Commerce of the great city of New York is a "bogus" organization, whether the cotton exchange or the produce exchange, or if the stock exchange are bogus organizations?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that such gambling institutions as the gentleman enumerates certainly come under the head of "bogus" outfits. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And how many of the members of those organizations are below 25 years of age?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And does the gentleman know that the State of New York, with its vast population, in proportion to its population, was second in number in sending troops down to the Mexican border?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. GORDON. And I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that his own State constitution compels them to keep up their militia to not less than 12,000 men.

Mr. MEEKER. I would like to ask the gentleman if we do not give the wrong impression when we imply that when all the men of an eligible age are to be chosen by selection it means that they are not willing to go? I assume that every man in America is willing to go.

Mr. ANTHONY. I, too, do not question the willingness of the men of America to serve their country, and that is the reason we will have no trouble in getting all the volunteers this country will ever have need for.

Mr. MEEKER. That being true, is it not practical sense to let the Government supervise the selection of the men who go?

Mr. ANTHONY. We propose to do that in this bill by applying all the principles of the conscript exemptions to the volunteer, so that we can use the same discriminating judgment in the selection or rather the acceptance of our volunteers as we would with the conscript.

Mr. POU. Can not the Government apply a selection to the volunteers exactly as it may be applied to any other?

Mr. ANTHONY. Exactly. So that any man who is necessary, for instance, to munition-factory service will be left where he will do the country the most good.

Mr. SHERLEY. Am I correct in understanding you to say that men will volunteer if they will come in organizations from various States, but that they will not volunteer to fill up the Regular Army and the National Guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not so readily, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. How does the gentleman expect to fill up those organizations, which are the ones that most quickly can be supplied and put in shape for fighting?

Mr. ANTHONY. We propose to fill them up by the draft, if necessary, as proposed in this bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, the gentleman is to try out his volunteer system, and if he does not get sufficient men for volunteer organizations to be created, he then proposes to draft in order to fill organizations already created?

Mr. ANTHONY. It may be absolutely unnecessary, and we do not propose to resort to the draft until it is necessary from the military standpoint.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, the gentleman thinks that you can expedite matters by creating organizations from the bottom up rather than by building up existing organizations?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no. My argument in regard to the proposed additional army of one-half million men is that we create a more effective Military Establishment by means of a call for volunteers. We would thus get the very best men in the land to fill its ranks, and they are the men who fight winning battles.

Mr. SHERLEY. But leaving aside the question of the psychology of men, the gentleman is talking about time, and yet, if I understand him aright, those organizations which are now in a position best to be put into service at war strength he proposes to hold back and wait until the volunteer system has either won or lost.

Mr. ANTHONY. No. We propose the same authority as the administration bill proposes, absolutely. We do not change that authority in any respect.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman may want to get those figures right about enlistments. Here is a clipping from a Kansas paper, possibly from the gentleman's own paper.

Mr. ANTHONY. If it is from my paper, it will tell the truth.
Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will permit, I will read it.
I read:

At the Kansas City station, which includes all of Kansas, 73.7 per cent of the allotment has already been filled. Kansas has done her duty—and the Kansas City station leads all others in the central district. Chicago, which was boasting its superior loyalty and accusing Kansas of being yellow only a few months ago, has enlisted only 18.1 per cent of its allotment. St. Louis is last, with only 11.2 per cent.

Those are evidently the figures that the gentleman from Kansas referred to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I am glad to have them.

Mr. LITTLE. Did the gentleman say 73 per cent?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; 73 per cent.

Mr. LITTLE. I was informed that the entire enlistment there was filled up to full war strength. I got that from the Bureau of Navigation, not from the newspapers.

Mr. BORLAND. Sometimes the newspapers are right.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Kansas gets away from the question that was asked him by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], I would like him to answer this question: Is there one single thing in the committee bill that prevents any man or discourages any man from exercising the right to enlist who has not enlisted?

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely not. It expedites enlistment.

One of the regrettable things in connection with this legislation is the vicious attitude of the metropolitan newspapers toward this bill. Instead of telling the people the truth that we are proposing a step in the practical creation of an army far in advance of the minority plan, they seem to have entered into a conspiracy to misrepresent, by raising a cloud of dust by defamation of the American volunteer. Let the truth be known that we are giving the President everything he has asked for in his bill, the draft, the conscription, and the full power to use it if it becomes necessary, but in addition to it all we provide the call for volunteers, which, in our opinion, will make it unnecessary for the President to stain the pages of any future history of this country with the enforcement of such an un-American military measure. I stand ready to put the power of conscription into the hands of the Government now, but I do not believe its use should be resorted to unless necessity should demand.

Of course, conscription is the easiest even if not the most patriotic way to fill the ranks of an army. Every technical militarist in the United States, every admirer of the great military machines which have been created by the military governments of Europe has longed for the time when such a system could be installed in our own country. When the great war broke forth two years ago and complications set in which threatened to embroil the United States this movement for compulsory service was inaugurated in the shape of a destructive campaign of criticism from military high brows, first directed against the National Guard, which Congress by special legislation was endeavoring to build up as the country's second line of defense. It is my belief that one of the purposes in some minds of keeping the National Guard in the Federal service for the past year in a monotonous, inane, and futile patrol of the Mexican border was in the hope that it would discourage these citizen soldiers and destroy the National Guard, most of whom left good jobs at home and who were ready and willing to serve their country in a real war, but who naturally tired of the hopeless military inactivity which prevailed on the Rio Grande. Nearly every Regular Army officer will privately admit the fine showing made by the guard in spite of the criticisms which filled their official reports, and which have been repeated by the newspapers of the country. But the National Guard emerged from it all a splendid military force, seasoned by its training in the field, and of which the country is glad to make use of in the present emergency. Failing to destroy the National Guard with their uncalled-for criticism, these same conspirators, with the yelping of the metropolitan newspapers, are now denouncing the American volunteer for the same purpose of paving the way for the installation of a military system which is totally foreign to American ideals and American history. There is no question but that some people would like to set up in this country exactly the same form of a military autocracy which we are telling the military monarchists of Europe can no longer be tolerated under our present-day ideals of world democracy.

Of course, this country, having embarked in the world war, must prepare itself to do its part, and no one will go further than I to do so effectively; but I believe that the Representatives of the people of the United States will carefully deliberate before adopting military measures which are not to be approved by the American people themselves.

Every time this country becomes embroiled in war it is perhaps natural, but hardly creditable, that the people along the

eastern and western seacoasts—which, if we did not have the adequate Navy the United States unquestionably possesses, would be more or less exposed—allow themselves to be thrown into a panic, which is voiced by the newspapers of the big cities along the seacoasts and the clamor of their Representatives in Congress for the most extreme measures of protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. ANTHONY. In these great cities along the coast is centered the greater part of the financial wealth of the country and it was the moneyed interests of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco which, in the Spanish War, lost their heads and saw a Spanish fleet approaching every night in their dreams to bombard them, and these same people to-day, instead of using calm judgment and common sense in our military preparation, evidence that they would stop at nothing in the effort to have extreme measures adopted, which, while satisfying to their own sense of security and financial profit, would prove abhorrent to the common people throughout this great land.

One of the arguments made in the minority report is that an opportunity is offered for volunteers in the provision which has already been made for the voluntary enlistment in the Regular Army of individuals who desire to offer their services. It is wrong in the War Department to advance such an argument to the country at this time, and it is equally wrong in the minority to claim that they are making provision for volunteers by a willingness to accept individual enlistments. This House must remember that there is no such thing as a volunteer army unless it is recruited as such in local units; by organizations in the various States with the pride of those States from which the regiments come and with the pride of those communities from which the companies of volunteers spring behind them.

It is also idle for the opponents of a volunteer army at this time to cite the mistakes which may have been made in past wars in the organization of volunteers as applicable now because these same criticisms can not justly be made to-day.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that the National Guard organizations are recruited from particular localities?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true so far as it is possible to so recruit them. But it is also true that from now on that practice will be discontinued.

Mr. AYRES. Why so?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is the purpose of the War Department, if this legislation is enacted, to wipe out the National Guard, and the country will never hear of it again.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to that part of the Senate bill which answers the question propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] as to interference by our volunteer plan with filling up the National Guard. I read from the Senate bill. It provides that—

All voluntary enlistments shall be in the Army of the United States and those enlisted may be assigned upon enlistment to any force of said Army not required to be raised exclusively by selective draft.

In other words, I want to ask the opinion of the gentleman as to what he thinks of the proposition of making an army of 500,000 conscripts only, and the proposition that nobody but conscripts can go into this army. What does the gentleman think of that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is absolutely un-American to pass such a proposition.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that there lurks behind this bill, if there is not indicated on its face, the purpose of fixing conscription as the permanent military policy of the country?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly it will be the permanent military policy of the country if it is enacted in the legislation now before the House.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I want to know in principle what difference there would be between requiring men to remain in the service and requiring men to enter the service? Is it not a fact that an

officer in the United States Army can resign to-day and quit the service voluntarily if he desires to do so?

Mr. ANTHONY. He can.

Mr. SIMS. Then does the minority propose to amend their bill so as to require the compulsory continuance in the service of officers and enlisted men?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The officers are better paid than the privates, and they seldom resign. They are like Members of Congress in that respect. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. In other words, they can keep the officers of the Regular Army in without resort to compulsion?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. Now I would like to make this one point, if I may be permitted. It has been suggested on the floor of this House that it is our duty from the military standpoint to pass this bill, because it has the approval of the General Staff of the Army. It is true that the General Staff of the Army was organized some years ago for the purpose of formulating the military policies of the country, but, Mr. Chairman, I deny that the bill which came from the War Department or the measure of the minority has ever had the approval of the General Staff, as a whole. It has not. When the Secretary of War came before us he admitted that the bill which is supported by the minority was drawn up by himself; that he had consulted individual members of the General Staff in its preparation, but that he had not consulted the General Staff as a body, even in this great emergency with which the country is confronted. So that it is absolutely incorrect to speak of this bill as having the formal indorsement of the General Staff.

And now one more word, directed to the criticisms of Members here on the floor against the volunteer army. All the every officer. It is unquestionably the purpose to officer this proposed army, whether they are to be conscripts or volunteers, mistakes ever made by our volunteer armies in the past have come from the fact that they have been, in some cases, officered by inexperienced men. Under the provisions of this bill the President of the United States has the absolute power to appoint with skilled officers, first from the Regular Army, then from the National Guard, from former officers of volunteers, from all the military sources that remain in the country, so that this whole charge of improperly officering the volunteer forces to be raised will lie only in case the War Department fails to do its duty. This bill is properly safeguarded under the volunteer law of 1914, passed by this body, which law did have the approval of the General Staff at the time it was recommended to this House.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would not the President have the same sources for officers of the volunteers that he would have for officers for the conscripts?

Mr. ANTHONY. We give the President exactly the same sources for officers for the volunteers as the bill would give him for an army of conscripts. [Applause.]

There is no question but that the American volunteer is the most effective fighting man that the world has ever seen. The only criticism that can be laid at the door of American volunteer armies heretofore organized was due to the fact that in some instances there were not trained officers to command them. Such criticism can not justly be made to-day, because under the act of 1914, under which the volunteers provided for in this bill will be organized, the President has the sole power to appoint efficient officers to command them. We can apply, and this bill authorizes, the same judicious foresight to the selection of our volunteer army that we would give to the selection of a conscript army. An example of the confused reasoning on this question which is advanced in the arguments of the advocates of the minority report is typical:

The kind of thinking that is done in denunciation of the American volunteer plan appears in this extract which the Indianapolis News quotes from the New York World as final proof of "the failure of the volunteer system":

"When the British volunteer army was recruited men whose services were invaluable to the military industries of the country freely enlisted, and the damage was incalculable. In one battalion there were 200 expert munition workers, who were worth their weight in gold to their country in the industry that they deserted."

And much more to the same purpose.

But why should America three years afterwards stupidly copy English blunders? The recruiting of the English munitions workers was not due to a defect in the volunteer principle, for conscription would have worked precisely the same.

The fault was with English foresight in not rejecting the volunteer munitions workers, because England did not foresee how valuable they would be at home. The volunteer plan does not imply that every volunteer must be accepted any more than the draft plan implies that everybody must be drafted into actual ranks. There will be in any case judicious selection.

Mr. FIELDS. Will my colleague yield to me to make a little statement?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FIELDS. I just want to state to the membership of the House that I shall print in the Record, as bearing upon the

point of the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] and myself this morning, an article in the New York American of April 17, by John Temple Graves, which is headed as follows:

Army in a year by draft plan. General Staff to call out first 500,000 boys under 21 years of age.

I wish to print this article and let it go to the public for what it is worth.

Mr. ANTHONY. In conclusion I want to express the hope that the membership of this House will be able to withstand the clamor of the metropolitan press, will be able to withstand the pressure that is being brought to bear upon it by artificial means through the machinations of these so-called "defense" societies. I hope that the membership of this body will be able to resist all official pressure, that it will be able when this bill comes to a vote to be governed by its own conscience and its own honest convictions, that it will be able to say that it is a body of real representatives of the people, and not largely composed of official rubber stamps and rabbits, as its critics have charged it with being. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is natural that every man who is willing to serve his country in time of war should wish to feel that he is impelled by patriotism and a sense of duty to his country to volunteer, rather than compelled by its laws to serve. It is impossible not to sympathize with this sentiment, but wars are not won by sentiment or paid for with sympathy. If one opposes the position of those who advocate the volunteer system it is impossible to avoid reckoning with a prejudice against compulsory service of any character, but the necessities of war can not be controlled by prejudice, however deep seated or well grounded. In war there is but one question to be answered. That question is, "How can the war be won in the shortest time with the smallest sacrifice?" No one dares to say that the volunteer system is the answer to that question. It is not suggested for its intrinsic merit, for it has none, but as a concession to sentiment and a compromise with prejudice.

Universal obligatory service has always been recognized as an essential principle of our Government, but the enforcement of the obligation by draft has never been adopted as the policy of the country at the beginning of a war. The draft has always been a last resort, when all those who were willing to serve and all who could be persuaded to serve or ridiculed or threatened into serving had joined the colors. It was odious, therefore, because it differentiated the patriot from the slacker and branded the drafted man with the stigma of the coward and the poltroon. It is this differentiation, this stigma, which the method of applying the draft as a last resort attached to the drafted man which makes it offensive. The point I am trying to make is that it is not the principle of universal obligatory service but the application of the draft as a last resort which is repugnant.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have only 20 minutes. I can not yield. The bill reported by the committee does not remove the objection; it preserves it. No such differentiation or stigma attaches or can attach to the selective draft adopted as a policy in the first instance, for such a policy is based upon universal liability to service and assumes the willingness of every man to serve when he is called. [Applause.]

The so-called volunteer system is always advocated in the name and for the sake of the volunteer, but it is not the man who is willing to serve, but the man who is unwilling to serve who profits by its adoption.

Even those who advocate it do not dare to rest the safety of the Nation upon it alone. They assert that we have but to call for volunteers to get an immediate, spontaneous, and adequate response, but they have not the courage of this conviction. If they had, this bill would authorize a call for volunteers, and stop there. Instead, the bill provides for volunteering, but "passing the buck" to the President, authorizes him to draft if a sufficient number do not offer themselves. They exhibit the sort of spirit which the volunteer system always inculcates. It is the spirit of "let George do it." Thus the men with the highest sense of public duty and of greatest usefulness and spirit are sacrificed at the very first. Men who would be more useful in industry go to the front, while those whom industry could spare stay at home.

There are two fundamental objections to the volunteer system. First, it takes those who ought not to go; and second, it exempts those who ought to go.

If the plan proposed by the committee could be understood in all its cowardly surrender to expediency, in all its weak

yielding to prejudice and naked subversion of principle, it could not stand a moment. But this compromise is veneered with reasonableness and varnished over with a false appeal to patriotism. It pretends to appeal to the patriotic impulse of men to volunteer, while threatening them with the draft. It pretends to invite men to serve, while really affording a way to avoid service.

The whole philosophy of those who advocate the volunteer system is boiled down and condensed into this question: "Why should not the man who is willing to fight for his country be permitted to volunteer?" The answer to that question is this: "The right to enlist or not to enlist, to serve or not to serve, is not a privilege granted to the individual, but an obligation imposed by the Government. [Applause.]

The people of the United States are neither cowards nor slackers. Patriotism is a latent virtue, but its spark is found in every human breast. Every man can not serve his country on the field of battle, nor can every man serve with equal sacrifice to himself, his associates, his family, or his country, and it is not fair nor is it efficient to impose upon each individual the burden of determining whether he will undertake a service which is obligatory upon all alike.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to pause here to tell a story. I think I have never told it to any man here. It is a personal story, and I tell it only because it seems to have a bearing upon the questions which we are now considering.

When the Spanish-American War began I was 15 years old, the youngest of six boys, and going to high school. We all felt that at least one out of the six ought to respond to the call of the President. The others had ties which it was difficult to break and obligations from which they could not easily be relieved, while I was already a member of the militia and was bound by no obligations whatever. So we agreed that I should enlist, but, as I was under age, I had to have the consent of my father and mother. I went to my father to get his consent. A year ago he would have been called a "hyphenated American," for he was born in a foreign land, but he thought that he could give one son out of six to sustain the policies of the country which had given him opportunity and the benefit of free institutions. [Applause.] Together we went to my mother to get her consent. She, too, was a "hyphenated American." I never knew one who loved her native country better or was more loyal to the country of her adoption. For years an invalid, she was in bed with a sickness from which she never recovered. I told her what we boys had decided, and she asked me one question: "Do you think the country needs you?" I said, "Yes, mother." She signed the paper that permitted me to enlist with a hand that never faltered, while the tears rolled down her face. I know there are millions like her in the United States; but, gentlemen, it is not fair that the mothers of the country should bear the burden of the decision to send their sons to the front. That burden belongs to the Congress of the United States and the Government, whose policy and national life are at stake in this struggle. [Applause.]

It is charged in opposition to the principle of selective draft that the spirit of democracy and of liberty is opposed to any form of compulsion. Yet we pass laws every day, the wisdom and justice of which is denied by thousands, many of whom willingly accept them and all of whom are compelled to obey them. We pass tax laws, the injustice and inequality of which are often asserted by those who pay, and not infrequently admitted by those who impose and administer them, but all alike are obliged to bear the burdens which they impose, although the burden may be heavier upon some than upon others. We might as well say that only those who admit the wisdom and justice of the law should be required to obey it as to say that only those who are willing to serve should be required to serve; that only those who volunteer to pay taxes should be required to pay them as that only those who volunteer to serve should be required to serve. Such a doctrine is not democracy—it is anarchy. [Applause.]

The obligation to serve is a universal obligation, and the Government, which represents the democracy of the people, is in better position to say who shall serve, and when and how service shall be rendered, than the individual.

However repugnant the idea of compulsion may be, the fact is that force is indispensable to sovereignty. Without it, no nation can be secure against internal dissension or foreign aggression; without it, the universality and coincidence of benefit and duty, of privilege and obligation, of citizenship and service, are denied with impunity; without it, nations are mere associations of individuals, without power to secure individual liberty or enforce national policy. However we may try to delude ourselves into the belief that democracy and freedom

have been won by the law of love, history forces us to the conclusion that liberty has been won and democracy sustained by the law of force. [Applause.]

By force we won independence; by force we won the freedom of the seas; by force we won our right to be called a Nation; by force we won a place among the Nations of the world.

Almost without exception, every war in which we have been engaged has been unnecessarily prolonged by the failure to adopt sound and vigorous policies at the outset, by the volunteer system, by short enlistments, by yielding to mild preachments. We can not now afford the unnecessary waste of life and treasure which the repetition of those mistakes will entail. We do not know whether this war will last three months or three years; whether we will need 500,000 men or 5,000,000. Wisdom requires that we base our calculations upon the longer period and the greater number. These considerations lead inevitably to the adoption of the selective draft at once. We dare not risk the failure of the volunteer system. We can not afford to venture victory on a compromise.

We are engaged in the greatest task that any nation has ever undertaken or can undertake. To this task we must bring every resource of the Nation. We are at war. Our first and only business is to win the war. War is the hardest and most practical of all undertakings. To its success every effort must be bent, every needful sacrifice made. There can be no surrender to compromise, no yielding to sentiment, no catering to prejudice. War is a hard-fisted, hard-headed, hard-hitting business. In it to yield to soft measures is to yield success. I have not thought that we shall be other than victors, but I will take no chances on having to accept loser's terms by adopting "rabbit" policies. I am eye-single about this business; to me there is but one ray of hope in all its terrible necessities. It is that by putting forth every effort now, by adopting sound and vigorous policies at the outset, we may end the war speedily without great sacrifice of lives or treasure.

The other day I heard a man make the statement that he was willing to fight for the country against invasion, but was unwilling to fight in the trenches in Europe. Such a statement must proceed from a misapprehension of the duties of citizenship and the rules and purposes which should govern the conduct of individuals and the relations of the nations to each other. To fight in self-defense, to fight against invasion, is not patriotism; it is self-interest. It is obedience to the first law of nature—self-preservation, which even the brutes obey. To fight for a principle, to fight for the rights of others and of your country, which you yourself may never have occasion to exercise; to fight for the freedom of the seas; to fight for the policies of your country and its place among the nations of the world wherever and whenever they are assailed—that is patriotism. [Applause.]

I have no sympathy or patience with the idea that we are making war to democratize Germany. We have no more business to make war to democratize Germany than we would have to make war to Christianize the Turks. I have even less sympathy with the view that we are fighting alone to enable a few men to risk their lives and the peace of the country on ships, belligerent or otherwise. We are fighting for the freedom of the seas for every man and every nation [applause], for the international policy of the United States and its place among the nations of the world, for a voice in the terms of peace and in making the rules which will govern the conduct of nations and mold the designs and purposes of civilization when peace has been once more established. [Applause.] To such a purpose a man may well yield the full measure of his obligation to his country.

The issue in this matter is the privilege of the individual to enlist or not to enlist, on the one hand, and the right of the Government whose policies and national life are at stake to adopt those measures which most certainly make for success, on the other. On such an issue I prefer to stand with my country. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I accord to every man only that which I ask of them, that in this hour of stress I am moved only by patriotic motives in that which I now advocate. I regret exceedingly that it has been necessary for me to part company with the distinguished minority leader, my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]. But, looking at things as I do, I can not help but part company with him and his associates, for I believe that they are wrong in what they advocate.

I wish to state at the outset that I feel it is deeply to be regretted that the grave question we are about to decide has been surrounded by such a campaign of misrepresentation and the Members of this House have been subjected to such a tirade

of vilification as has occurred during the last few weeks. Never has there been such a misrepresentation of facts and never has the moneyed power resorted to such contemptible tactics to coerce a legislative body into bending to its will. Selfish greed, not patriotic motives, has inspired most of this abuse, and the men who instigated it are those who are preparing to profit most by the war, to gather in the blood-stained shekels, and wax rich off the misfortunes of others. It has been my observation that most of these so-called American-rights leagues, defense leagues, and so forth, are personified by men who have big financial interests at stake, and who will reap the golden harvest from the great calamity that has overtaken this Nation. They are interested in the manner in which this law is framed and who shall give their lives on the firing line, if need be, not so much from a sense of duty to their country but from a sense of apprehension as to how they are going to fare between now and the time the final gong is rung on the tragedy. That is the reason so many of them are anxious that the youths of our country be sent to the front and the able-bodied men denied that opportunity, even though it may be their wish to go.

If the call for volunteers should come these men know that many, probably thousands and hundreds of thousands of the men now working in their factories would feel it their duty to respond to the call and thus the men who are figuring on reaping the harvest from the inflated prices would have their output limited and their source of revenue reduced.

Wisely have they planned to have the boys who are of no use to them in a manufacturing way face the brunt of battle and stand the onslaughts that may be made against this country. The bill for selective conscription limits the age of those who may be drafted at a minimum of 19 and a maximum of 25 years. It can not be contended that any man has reached the zenith of his ability either mental or physical at the age of 25. Why, then, should this Government assume the right to say that because you are under 25 years of age you must go to war, and because another man is over that age he must not go whether he wants to or not? Why has this country the arbitrary right to say to the youth, you shall go but to the young man you shall stay. Is it fitting or right that this country in time of war shall pick out the vocation of its male citizens? The jingo press has tried to call down maledictions on the heads of those Members of this House who are supporting the majority report on this bill on the ground that they are unpatriotic and un-American. It is a clever form of abuse designed to arouse the people to a frenzy, but it is as false as it is contemptible. In fact conscription in itself is autocratic, not democratic; it savors of the monarchies of Europe and not the Americanism of the United States. Right here I want to state that if we must resort to conscription I propose that we shall raise the age limit so that every able-bodied man in the United States who is yet in the prime of life shall be subject to the call. At least this will place no unjust discrimination against the youths of our land, will not penalize them because they happen to be younger in years than you and I; will not cast a shadow over their young lives or blot them out because the world is young to them. And it will also place no unjust discrimination against the man of mature years who feels that it is his duty to respond to the call but who will be barred because perchance he was born in the eighties and not the nineties has reached the age of discretion and is not the unformed youth.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that the campaign of vilification has been going on over the country. I do not know where it originates, but I do know that this morning's Post in the city of Washington, carried a three-page advertisement, and in the columns of that paper, paid for by some one, were three editorials taken from papers edited in my district. I am very sure that the gentleman who wrote the editorials did not understand what we are advocating here to-day. [Applause.]

The whole trouble about this proposition is that it is not understood. It has been a campaign of misrepresentation from the very start. Terms are used and mixed up, and the people that use them do not know to what they refer. For instance, "universal training" is brought into the argument and into this debate time after time, and there is no universal training in either bill—either of the majority or that which the minority advocates. Universal training is another proposition, and so is universal service.

Universal military training and conscription are two entirely different subjects. I call attention to this matter because of the fact that in the campaign of abuse that has been going on any man who dared to state that he was in favor of trying out the volunteer service before resorting to conscription has immediately been accused of being opposed to universal military training. This doubtless has been done with a design, for there

are millions of people in the United States who are in favor of universal military training but are radically opposed to the other. I believe a large majority of the people believe that the young men of this country should be properly trained in military tactics so they could act promptly and efficiently in time of need. Universal military training should be a part of our general system of education. Knowledge along military lines should be inculcated in the mind of the young man the same as knowledge along industrial lines or any other business pursuits. He should be prepared to support and defend his country as he prepares himself to defend his home, his business, or his profession; but universal military training does not mean that he shall spend years in the idle routine of a military camp when he could be spending his time and energies far better in industrial pursuits. Give him the knowledge, inculcate in him the patriotism, and we will have an Army that will defend any nation, any country, without resorting to draft or conscription.

The accusation that has been spread by the propaganda that is trying to force a conscription bill through this House that the supporters of this majority report are hampering the President in the conduct of this war is false and has no foundation in fact. On the contrary, the passage of this bill would facilitate his actions, and would result in providing an army quicker than if we waited for selective draft. The Secretary of War has himself declared that it would take several months before a census could be taken and arrangements made whereby conscription could be put into effect. It has been estimated that it would take until September or October before the draft system could be placed in operation, and would probably be November before the men who were drafted could be placed in training.

Col. Roosevelt has stated that he could raise an army of 25,000 in two months and have them in the trenches in four. A prominent National Guard man in my State informs me that he can raise a brigade in Iowa in 30 days. From other sources comes the information that brigades, divisions, and companies can be raised in from 2 weeks to 30 days.

It is safe to say that if a call for volunteers was made we could have, beside the National Guard, 500,000 men under arms inside of four months. If we resort to conscription, the system will not be ready to be put into effect until long after we could have an army ready for the field under the volunteer system. Is it hampering the President to provide him with an army to defend this country? Is it un-American to resort to the quickest way to put this country in a state of preparedness? This bill provides that should sufficient volunteers not be forthcoming the President can resort to selective draft. It also provides that he can secure the census to make the draft as soon as he desires, and that he can be making all his arrangements while the call for volunteers is being answered. In plain words this bill provides for the quickest possible way of securing an army; a call for volunteers while a selective-draft system is being prepared and conscription as soon as it is ready to be applied if the volunteer system does not bring sufficient men.

The war councils have said that raw recruits would stand no chance if they were sent against the trained armies of Europe, and this argument is being used in favor of an immediate conscription plan, but I respectfully submit that trained armies are only secured by training soldiers, and the quicker these men are enlisted and put in training the sooner will we have the trained army that is necessary.

The only question before you now is the question whether the volunteer system is better to raise an army than the conscript system, and I want to call the attention of this House to the fact, and I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, upon the fight that he has made, a part of which he has already won for those who stand behind the President in this fight. There is no one standing out for the President's plan. One of the main things was the conscripting of boys under 21, and that they have abandoned. They have raised the minimum age to 21, as we raised it, and they raised the maximum age to 40, as the majority of the committee raised it.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that if it had not been for the 12 gentlemen on that committee that made the fight you would not have had these ages raised, as they admit now that they should have been raised. [Applause.]

I want to call attention to one or two other things briefly. You hear a great deal said about the volunteer enlistments in the National Guard and the Regular Army. It is true that that opportunity is afforded to everybody, but I call your attention to the fact that in the National Guard all over this country, especially in my district, there is no opportunity to enlist in the National Guard as a unit, only in about 7 towns out of 100.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. Why is it impossible for them to enlist as units in the National Guard?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Because the State has to furnish an armory, and armories are not there in the communities. There is a limit to the State furnishing armories.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. If the gentleman will allow me, one of the provisions of the Army bill is that the recruiting officer has a right to put a man in the Regular Army or the National Guard.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is true. The volunteer system, as we are advocating it in this bill, is founded on this fact, that it is better and you make your war more popular if you allow the units to come from small towns in the different States. There are any number of towns in my district that want to furnish 10, 15, or 20 boys—perhaps not a full company—but they want the boys to go out and fight as a unit; they want them to be associated in the field and in the battle and in the training together. I think it is a very good plan, and it tends to get enlistments. There is not any question about that. The plan of the War Department is not to take men as units but to take them from families and distribute them here and there and everywhere—put the man from Texas in a regiment from New York, composed of men that he never saw before. Just think of taking a boy 19 years old away from his father and mother, unwilling to go into the service, and putting him in a regiment where he never saw one of the men before, and putting him there not only for one year but for three or four years, and perhaps to go out and die. That is the plan of the War Department.

A Member has put in the RECORD an article that is supposed to have the authority of the War Department, saying that they did not intend to take the boys from 21 to 25, but the General Staff proposition is to take the first class from boys 19 to 21. Was there ever a more cold-blooded proposition proposed in a free Government than that? [Applause.] Talk about the Germans' ruthlessness, taking a man, their enemy, and compelling him to work for them, and yet in this Congress you propose to take your own boys and put them on the firing line; take them unwilling and put them up to be shot at. Gentlemen, although that proposition is already conceded in this House to be wrong, it is not dead. In the body at the other end of the Capitol they are now debating it, and if you by your votes defeat the majority's bill in this House you stand in danger of having to vote for that tomorrow or the next day. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not a fact that even Germany, a military autocracy, has never attempted to break up the territorial organization of the German Army; that Bavarian fights with Bavarian, Wurttemberger with Wurttemberger, and Saxon with Saxon; and yet the War Department has been as insistent as it has on any part of its program on the proposition that our men shall not be territorially organized, and that Maine shall fight with California and Texas with Minnesota?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right; and as I understand it they go further than that—

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure my colleague from Iowa desires to be fair at least to the War Department. I would like to ask him if there was any such argument made by the Secretary of War or any representative of the War Department before the Committee on Military Affairs that it was the desire of the War Department to do any such thing as the gentleman from Iowa has said?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. To what does the gentleman refer?

Mr. McKENZIE. Taking the men from Texas and putting them with men from New York and breaking up the entire territorial organization of the troops. Was there any argument made for any such proposition?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand there was.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to have the gentleman cite me to it in the hearings.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Unquestionably there was in the original draft of the bill by the War Department, as sent to the committee, a provision to the effect that all volunteer enlistments should hereafter be made in the Army of the United States. I asked the Secretary of War what that meant, and he said that it meant that the present organization of the Regular Army and of the National Guard would be destroyed during the period of this emergency and there would be substituted for them the Army of the United States, and that under this the President would have the power to send any enlisted man to any organiza-

tion anywhere that he saw fit. But let me go further and state that the committee turned that proposition down, but before the committee reported the bill I received a letter from the Secretary of War receding from that position.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. The statement that I challenge is the statement that the Secretary of War or any man representing the Secretary of War or the War Department advocated a military organization that would take men from one State arbitrarily and put them with men from other States, instead of permitting them to go as State units, and, furthermore, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] as to why they were going to enlist them in the Army of the United States, the Secretary said that it was in the interest of economy, in order that they would not have to have two recruiting stations, one for the National Guard and one for the Regular Army, in the same community.

Mr. DENT. That is the provision in the bill now.

Mr. McKENZIE. I challenge the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that the Secretary of War or any one from the War Department advocated this inhuman and brutal proposition that he has set forth.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Who drew the original bill, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. McKENZIE. Search me! [Laughter.]

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Did not the War Department draw it?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. In order that the facts may be kept as near correct as possible, on page 10, line 5, of the original draft of the bill that was submitted to the Military Committee by the Secretary of War there was this provision:

All volunteer enlistments shall be in the Army of the United States, and those enlisted may be assigned upon enlistment to any force of said Army not required to be raised exclusively by the selective draft.

That was stricken out by the committee, and the Secretary of War finally yielded upon it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And, Mr. Chairman, that identical bill is now being considered in the Senate bill?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And that is the bill that we will have to act on here finally?

Mr. DENT. Yes; probably.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is the bill that you are voting against to-day. [Applause.] I realize that it is very hard sometimes to keep track of the War Department, and I do not want to be understood as criticizing the General Staff. I have been here in Washington now for two years, and my admiration for the gentlemen of the General Staff is much greater than it was when I came here; but they make mistakes, just like everyone else, and I call the attention of this House to the fact, and every gentleman upon our committee knows it, that the General Staff of the War Department made a rule that they were not going to allow the National Guard to be enlisted with any more units, and when the Secretary of War came before our committee some of the gentlemen of the committee called his attention to the fact that they had not utilized the national-defense act and had not allowed it to become operative; that there was a place there for more units, and they did not seem to realize it, and in two days after that the General Staff came out with the statement, and you read it in your morning newspaper, that the War Department had discovered that we had a national-defense act [laughter], and that there was a place for more enlistments in the National Guard.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman has stated that the War Department changed its mind on one or two things. Did the gentleman change his mind, and did the majority of the committee change their minds, when they changed the language of their amendment to the bill so that it did not "pass the buck" up to the President quite so hard as the language of the bill now reads?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Why, certainly. The gentlemen of the committee only had a few minutes in which to formulate their minds, and they did change their minds, and when they find they are wrong they are willing to change their minds and they are willing to admit it.

Mr. KAHN. And so is the War Department.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And the committee do not say that they have just discovered there was something in the law that they did not see there before when they had a chance to see it.

Mr. KAHN. But the gentleman does not give the War Department the right to change its mind, although he reserves to himself the right to change his.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We did give them the right. I am not criticizing; I am simply calling attention to it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not true that while the War Department reluctantly admitted that the national-defense act authorized the organization of new increments of the National Guard, the War Department is now declining to accept any of these new increments in the service though 20 States are ready to offer them? [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is absolutely correct, and I want to call the attention of the committee to another thing in the national-defense act that I do not believe every Member of the House understands. That act provided for this very emergency. There is no limitation to the National Guard. It is not 800 to a congressional district, but it must be 800, and they can take as many more as they have offered to it, and they are not taking what is offered to it, and yet they want to go out in my district and conscript young people there to go to war. Now, my friends—

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly, if I can get more time.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman can get more time. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. At the close of the Spanish-American War there was made an index list of those who had served as officers in that war, probably some 1,000, I think. They signed that for service when called upon. I notice in the bill which the committee brought in that there is no consideration whatever given to those men. Does the gentleman know why that was done?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Well, it was not thought best—I had the matter up—it was not thought best by the committee, and I am not saying but what it was right, and I think we all practically agreed to it, that on this bill, which is designed to cover an emergency, it was best to keep those features of general legislation off from the bill. The committee was wise in that. We probably will take that up in another bill.

Mr. DYER. Does not the gentleman think that it belongs in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. DYER. Does not the gentleman think that belongs in this bill, because it is necessary to provide officers, many more than are available? West Point is not sufficient to furnish them, although they are graduating them before time, and there are thousands of men trained and who have had experience, and why should they be slighted and not given an opportunity?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the committee tried to make as little difference in the bill reported as possible from the bill handed down by the War Department; and the War Department bill called for no provision as to Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state whether or not he would be in favor of it?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I would be in favor of it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am in favor of that myself, but on the advice of the majority of the committee it was thought best to leave it out.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman is a member of the committee. What does the gentleman call this bill introduced, a volunteer bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the gentleman believe under a volunteer bill we can raise the men?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I believe you can raise at least half a million men, and I know you can raise them better, quicker, and that it will do a great deal to popularize this war if you call for them. [Applause.]

Mr. EMERSON. Why does the gentleman put at the end of his bill a conscription feature? Was that part of a volunteer system, or a kind of a club?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; that is not a club.

Mr. EMERSON. What is that?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is to give the President authority to take them if—

Mr. EMERSON. But if you can get them by the volunteer system you do not need a club.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There might be a time coming when you can not get them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the gentleman can move to strike out the draft provision. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNS. I think the volunteer plan was put in there to give such gentlemen as the gentleman from Cleveland an opportunity to enlist.

Mr. EMERSON. I will enlist just as quickly as any Member of this House will enlist—just as quickly.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Now, gentlemen, this—

Mr. EMERSON. I want some of these noisy fellows to enlist; I want to have some of these fellows enlist who voted for Mr. Wilson because he kept us out of war first. Now, when they will enlist—

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. There is no question but that the gentleman wants us to enlist first. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think that some of those who wanted us to go to war ought to enlist?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The fact remains that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany now?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. And the gentleman pictured a few moments ago in a graphic description of the poor young men being taken from their homes and their mothers.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I tried to.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Now, under your volunteer system, where are you going to take them from? [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They volunteer themselves.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And they volunteer three years younger than they do under our plan.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If you want to go out of this House with me and walk out of your own accord, it is all right; but if I take hold of you and drag you out, it is another proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. How about the man who is holding back and does not want to go?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that your selective-conscription plan is a haven for sulkers.

Mr. JAMES. Then why did you put it in the bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that if I had my way it would not be in there as it is written, but you understand that in a committee you have to compromise some differences.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There were eight men who did not compromise certain differences.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You have compromised.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You have compromised the very fundamental feature. You have come over to the majority side on that.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Oh, yes; you have.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That was done before the discussion leading to the minority report in the committee, if the gentleman wants me to reveal committee proceedings.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Then you are not standing behind the President. And that is all the argument that you have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to say just a few words in regard to one feature running through all these debates, and that is this, that the volunteer system is a failure, and that we ought to avoid it, and yet it is the only system by which this country has defended itself for over 130 years. My friends, in yon Rotunda is a picture of the Surrender of Cornwallis. I ask some of you if that picture and the story that it tells is a failure? On the other side of the Rotunda is another picture, the Surrender of Burgoyne to Gen. Gates. Is that picture and the story that it tells a failure? This Congress is trying to write across those great pictures the words, "This is a lie." Is that great picture of Lincoln and his Cabinet at the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, made possible by the Volunteers of '61—is that picture a lie? You have in this great city of Washington many statues to the heroes of the Civil War—Gen. Logan, and many others. Are those lies. Was the story and the history that those men wrote a failure? My friends,

sitting in this House is one of our colleagues who volunteered in the Civil War, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD]. Is his life story a failure? I think not.

I hope that when this House votes on this measure it will repudiate this campaign of misrepresentation by such an overwhelming vote that the country will understand that these stories that we love so well were not a failure. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If I have any time.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman has spoken about the volunteers, and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact and ask him whether he knows it to be a fact or not—I do—that of the 300,000 or more who enlisted for the Spanish War, the volunteers who served in the Spanish War, 98 per cent of those are to-day in favor of universal military service as provided for in this amendment?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I know nothing about that. I presume it is like a great many other things the propaganda is telling us. It needs investigation. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was very much interested in the reference made to an advertisement in a certain newspaper published in the city of Washington this morning, because it undertook to set out editorials from every newspaper in the district of every man who voted against this war on the morning of the crucifixion—the morning of the 6th of April.

I want to ask you—and you can answer it later and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is going to insert the names of the battles in which our great generals fought—does the gentleman think that the man who publishes papers of that kind, wealthy men who sit in beautiful Venetian palaces and their purple opera houses, their gilded chairs, with red plush beneath them, while champagne glasses are clinking in the basement as one goes by there in the evening, can go on with that work forever and force the boys of this country between the ages of 19 and 25 years into the trenches of Europe and yet think a day of retribution will not come? [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The question may be pertinent, but I do not care to discuss it.

The volunteer soldier has always proven more efficient than the drafted soldier. The wars of the past have sufficiently proven this, and although one or two of our defense leagues have attempted to prove that the Revolutionary and Civil Wars were failures because our forefathers did not see fit to adopt selective draft, in the minds of the people they will ever remain as splendid achievements that could not have been accomplished had they been fought with men who were fighting because they were made to and not because their heart and soul were wrapped up in the welfare of their country. And just why is the volunteer army better? There are many reasons, and the principal one is that which I have touched upon before, that the volunteer is not merely a machine but puts his heart and soul into the conflict. Another reason is that volunteer units are much more proficient than other units. The community spirit is brought out in them. The volunteer companies are formed in the small towns and surrounding country. Comrades as boys, they volunteer as men, and side by side they fight as they had worked, with a common interest in each other and that comradeship that builds the proficient fighting machine. The rivalry that exists between units as to who shall be the honor unit brings out that spirit that goes to develop the true Americanism and make the men win against all odds. This is entirely lacking where men are thrown together with no incentive to fight and no comradeship with the men with whom they come in contact.

We are in the mightiest war of the ages. The world is engaged in a death struggle. Now that we have entered the arena we must bend every energy to win, and win an honorable victory as quickly and with as little loss of life and little suffering as possible. To win we must have an army, and I believe this method provides for an efficient army quicker and more practical than any other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, it is very fortunate that throughout the debate thus far, however sharp our differences of opinion may be upon this very important measure, it has been fully recognized that whether we be for the one bill or the other bill we are all actuated by patriotic motives, and desire to do that which is best for our country in winning this war.

I have often been asked whether my constituents in my district indorsed the position that I have taken upon the various ques-

tions that have come before us during this session. I have always been compelled to say that I do not know. I do not know the opinion of my constituents upon this question, but at the very outset I wish to make an observation upon what I believe to be the duty and responsibility of a Member of Congress upon this bill and upon all measures relating to the war. Ours is a representative government. Upon that we all agree, but we do not always agree upon what the term implies.

Are Members of Congress mere instruments to register the will of their constituents from day to day, or is it their duty to exercise their independent judgment upon matters vitally affecting our national life? I believe that true representative government requires me to exercise my own judgment to a very large degree. Upon this measure the question to be asked is not what do my constituents to-day think about it, but what would they think about it could I present to each one of them the information I have and my reasons for the course of action that I believe I should take. My constituents and your constituents desire that we adopt such policies as will win this war in the shortest possible time, with the least sacrifice of life.

Upon that we will all agree; and believing that the selective draft or conscription plan will do more to secure this result than the volunteer system, I shall unhesitatingly give it my support. I believe that in the end my constituents will indorse my action, for they are patriotic and they are intelligent; but even though I believed my action would not be indorsed by my constituents, my course would be the same.

In time of war, when the very existence of our Republic is in danger, my first duty is to my country and not to my constituents. My political future is of small moment at such a time as this. When I vote to raise an army under any plan, knowing that many of those in that army may give up their lives for their country, I have no right to consider my political fortunes in that vote. Political defeat will be a small sacrifice for me to make compared to sacrifices others will make.

If this was a war to extend our trade, I would either vote against raising an army at all or vote for the volunteer system. If an army was proposed merely to show to our allies that we were willing to cheer them by having our flag upon European battle fields, I would vote for the volunteer system. If this was a war to destroy autocracy for the purpose of bringing liberty to other peoples, I would vote for the volunteer system. But none of these is the kind of a war in which we are engaged to-day. We must fight the autocracy of Germany, not primarily in the interest of the German people, but primarily in our own interest. We must fight autocracy in Germany in order to preserve democracy in America. If the Imperial German Government is victorious now, then we may look forward to the possible destruction of our liberties here.

I had hoped that our war with Germany, so far as fighting is concerned, might be confined to the sea. I still hope so, but we must be prepared to go further and do whatever may be necessary to win the war. I confidently hope and believe that before we will be ready to send any of the troops provided for in this bill across the sea the war will be over, but we should recognize now that if the war is not over within a year we will have to fight, not only with money and supplies, but with men. I am not going to give my reasons for this conclusion, but I am sure that time will demonstrate the correctness of this statement.

Men on this floor have said that if this country was invaded by the enemy they would not hesitate to do anything necessary to meet such invasion, but when it comes to sending an army overseas, different considerations should prevail. I can not understand the reasoning of those gentlemen. If a year from now this war is not over, and it can be won by our sending a million men to join 12,000,000 men fighting our enemy, what kind of patriotism is it, what kind of statesmanship is it that would wait for these 12,000,000 men to be defeated and then say, "Now we will get ready to fight." America will be forced to become an armed camp for a generation in that event, and we will have fastened upon us exactly that militarism that the volunteer advocates so much deplore, and which we all wish to avoid. I might possibly favor the volunteer system if we did not need to conserve every resource we have to win this war, but if we would win within the next 12 months without the loss of American lives, it will be because in that time we will have utilized all possible means of necessary production here. We must feed our own people, we must feed and supply our Army, and in addition we must, in large part, feed and supply the armies of our allies. Food and munitions to our allies now is far more important than sending them additional men to feed and supply. The next 12 months we must devote to production and training an army. Production is the first essential, men the second. Our Army should then be selected so as to interfere as little as possible with production and not at all

with production absolutely essential to carry on the war. This can be done and done only through the selective draft. The President is given authority to exempt all citizens necessary to that production, and through this system only can the proper policy be applied of utilizing the men of the Nation where they can be most useful in winning the war. Those should be put in training who can best be spared, those having no one dependent upon them and those who are consumers rather than producers. Under the volunteer system a large majority of those who will enlist ought not to be spared now for that purpose. Under the draft those will be taken who can best be spared.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; for just a question.

Mr. LEVER. I understand that the bill of the majority of the committee exempts those engaged in the industries.

Mr. LENROOT. It authorizes the President to exempt them.

Mr. LEVER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that an amendment offered by the minority will include in that exemption also those engaged in agriculture?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not know what the intention of the minority is, but I am very frank to say to the gentleman that if no one else offers an amendment, I myself will offer one to make it clear that the President is authorized to exempt any class of industry that in his judgment is necessary for the national welfare.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LENROOT. Just for one question.

Mr. TOWNER. I just wanted to say that that amendment was adopted in the Senate, and I understand that the gentleman in charge of the bill on both sides have no objection to its being adopted here in the House.

Mr. LENROOT. I am thoroughly in favor of that amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. I think there will be very little, if any, opposition to it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. LENROOT. I regret I can not yield now.

But it is said that the bill provides for the same selection in volunteers as is provided in the case of draft. Granted; but if the volunteer system is to be so restricted, every man on this floor knows that the volunteer system will fail, for it has always been true that a large majority of volunteers have come from those engaged in productive employment, upon the farm, in the mine and factory. The bill reported by the majority of the committee provides that the draft can be resorted to only upon a finding by the President that the volunteer system is a failure. What would be the moral effect of such a finding upon Germany—our enemy? Would she not naturally conclude that America is unwilling to fight? And may not the very system that the majority advocates in this bill so prolong the war as to make it necessary to send our men across the sea? When if at the very outset we make it plain that the mighty power of this Nation is to be used to the utmost to win this war, and that if need be every man in it will be called upon to wage it to victory, it is more than probable that such a policy inaugurated now will result in an early ending of the war without the sacrifice of a single American life. [Applause.] The moral effect of that policy now will be worth more in ending the war than if we were prepared to send a half million volunteers to the battle fields of France to-morrow. [Applause.]

Much has been said as to whether this selective draft is not an infringement upon the democracy of America. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the selective draft is the only democratic principle that ought to be adopted in time of war.

What is a democracy? What is our democracy? Is it an aggregation of 100,000,000 of people who shall receive privileges from the Government but be under no obligations to it? Is it a democracy to say that 100,000,000 of people shall enjoy the blessings of that flag, but only those who are willing to volunteer and die shall protect it? Is that your idea of democracy? It is not mine. Universal obligation to serve ought to be just as important as the privileges that the American people enjoy. [Applause.]

Men say that this selective draft will be dragging a man from his home whether he be willing or not. Let me give you my idea of the selective draft as proposed by the minority and of the conscript system proposed by the majority when the volunteer system fails. With the minority proposition, when a man

is selected under a draft there will be no stigma upon him. He will walk out from his community, and his neighbors will point to him and say, "There is a man who has been chosen by our country for distinguished service. He is going to fight for us." That is the selective draft. But upon the failure of the volunteer system, when conscription is resorted to, what is the situation? The finger of scorn and of shame is pointed at the conscript then and he has the mark of a coward and a slacker upon him. Which shall we choose?

I am very much surprised at the attitude of so many of the Members from Southern States upon this matter of conscription. I wonder if you all realize that the Southern Confederacy in the Civil War, in the beginning of the second year of that war, resorted to conscription, resorted to a selective draft, based exactly upon the principle that is embodied in this bill? In the conscription laws of the Southern Confederacy there were certain exemptions of men working in mines, in furnaces, in foundries. The secretary of war of the Southern Confederacy was authorized to exempt from that selective draft operatives in woolen mills and in cotton mills and various other industries. Of that draft Col. Upton, whom you all know as one of the recognized military authorities of the United States, says in his work, *The Military Policy of the United States*:

The Confederate armies, blindly created for 12 months and as blindly disorganized, in the hope of filling their depleted ranks by voluntary enlistment, were rapidly hastening to their dissolution. The proud Confederacy, whose flag had floated within the distinct view of the National Capital, through blunders of legislation was tottering to its fall. A month more, or two months at the farthest, and the gigantic rebellion, organized to establish the sovereignty and independence of the States, would be a thing of the past, its leaders fleeing from the wrath of a loyal and outraged people. The situation was desperate; the crisis had arrived; the triumph of the Union was at hand.

At this juncture it was reserved for a Confederate Congress to explain for all time the meaning and extent of the power to raise and support armies. Appalled, but not unmanned, it rose to the occasion and setting an example that was followed a year later by the National Congress, resolved to meet the emergency by declaring every man between the ages of 18 and 35 a soldier. Had it been the object of the law to force reluctant citizens into the ranks the experiment might not have seemed hazardous, but going far beyond, to conscript armies numbering more than 100,000 soldiers, who had faithfully fulfilled their engagements and were already turning their affections homeward, the temerity of this legislation finds no parallel in the history of the world. But the end justified the means; the reorganization which was languishing was immediately completed; the ranks were filled up and given the strength of increasing numbers; the Confederate armies again took the field to baffle and resist the onset of the Union hosts until, dwindling to the former shadows of themselves, they were finally compelled to lay down their arms at Appomattox Court House.

So through the selective draft in the Civil War the Southern Confederacy was enabled to continue that war two years longer than would otherwise have been possible.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee and Mr. SHALLENBERGER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like 10 minutes more.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I am sorry I can not yield, because I want to refer to some other things, and I have only 10 minutes. If I can get further time, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was going to say that the ultimate history of the Civil War is that under that conscription system the South got pretty badly licked.

Mr. LENROOT. It certainly was, and personally I am very sorry that it resorted to the conscription, because otherwise the North would have won the war two years sooner than it did.

Mr. BURNETT. May I ask my friend—

Mr. LENROOT. I am sorry I can not yield further. I am always glad to yield when I have the time.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about tearing the boys from their mothers' breasts under this conscriptive system. Of course there is no such issue before the House of Representatives to-day, because both majority and minority have agreed upon the age limit of 21 to 40 years for conscription. But while that is true, I want to call attention to this fact, that while these gentlemen of the majority have such tender concern for the boys of 19 and 20 years of age, and while they call attention to the fact, as they view it, that it would be a crime to take such tender youths and put them in the Army, their own bill, under the volunteer system that they advocate, provides for taking boys not 19 years of age but 18 years of age, or one year younger than the Secretary of War has ever proposed should be subject to selective draft. And I want to call attention to the fact that if you gentlemen succeed in your volunteer system, as against this selective draft, more boys under 21 years of age will fight and die for their country, if any fighting is necessary, than will

fight and die under the selective draft system, even that proposed by the Secretary of War. [Applause.]

In the Civil War upon the northern side there was a total of 2,606,341 volunteers, and out of that number—I quote from records put into the printed proceedings of the Senate last Saturday by Senator NELSON—out of that number 1,158,438 were boys 18 years of age; 844,981 were boys 17 years of age; 231,051 were boys 16 years of age. Do you think the boys of 1917 are less patriotic than the boys of 1861? If you want to protect the boys and not take an undue number of them, you will support the selective draft and you will defeat the voluntary system.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield now. And in your solicitude for the mother with a breaking heart, why, of course, there are mothers whose hearts are going to break whether their boys be taken under the selective draft or whether they go under the volunteer system. But, as was said by the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], is it not apparent that instead of having mothers make the decision or the young boy make the decision, it is better to let the Government decide for them? [Applause.]

You know, as well as I do, that under your volunteer system in any community if under the selective draft five would be a fair proportion; under the volunteer system one boy would volunteer, and that would induce another and another and another, and under that volunteer system you would get them in crowds where you are breaking the hearts of twice as many mothers as you would under the selective-draft system.

I want to refer to another matter before I close. The gentleman from Nebraska, Gov. SHALLENBERGER, yesterday, in referring to his Swiss ancestors, paid a very eloquent and just tribute to that great and independent people, and he closed that eloquent tribute with the statement that the people in that little republic in the Alps had never bowed the head or crooked the knee to any prince or potentate upon earth. That was a just and well-deserved tribute to the people of the Swiss Republic, but it was a most unfortunate reference for the gentleman to make in attempting to use it as an argument for the volunteer system. I hold in my hand the military constitution of the Swiss Republic, and the first sentence is: "Every Swiss is bound to do military service." [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman mean to say that the selective-draft proposition whereby 1 man in 40 is taken in the same as the Swiss system where it says that every man is bound to do military service? [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. You may applaud the gentleman now, but you will come to regret your applause in just a minute, because in the same constitution—and the gentleman complains of this selective draft from 21 to 40—let me tell him what the Swiss system is. The Swiss system has three kinds of armies. The first line is the line that is called first in every war, exactly as will be called in this war, known as the Ausrug. They take the men from 20 to 32 years of age. The second line is called the Landwehr, composed of men between 33 and 40, and the third line is called the Landsturm, taking men between 41 and 48.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They take every man; and the proposition in this bill is to take one man out of eight between the ages of 19 and 25.

Mr. LENROOT. They do not take every man, as I have shown, unless every man is needed. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question. If we have 6,000,000 men between the ages of 20 and 32 years of age, which is the Swiss system, and we need only 500,000, would the gentleman take every man or select 500,000 by lot? [Applause.] I wait for an answer. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. LENROOT. The Swiss take every man between 20 and 32 with some exemptions. If we have 6,000,000 men between the ages of 20 and 32 all subject to military duty and if we only needed 500,000, would the gentleman take and put under arms 6,000,000 of them or would he select 500,000 by lot, as in this bill?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The administration plan proposes to have tribunals all over the country—

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, the gentleman gets away from the question. How would the gentleman select the 500,000?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would call for volunteers and get what I wanted.

Mr. LENROOT. The Swiss Republic, from which the gentleman's ancestors came, do not do it in that way, and the gentleman

referred to the Swiss Republic as the highest example of democracy in the world to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Suppose under the call for volunteers we get several million, how would the gentleman select the 500,000 out of them?

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, what would happen—and I want to be entirely fair—if we had a call for volunteers they would stop accepting them when they got the 500,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

THE NEW ARMY—HOW SHALL WE RAISE IT?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, fortunately there are no differences of opinion in the House relative to the objects sought to be accomplished or the ends we seek to attain in the enactment of this legislation. There were differences of opinion as to the wisdom, propriety, or necessity of making a declaration of war, but the die having been cast, the declaration having been made, the representatives of the American people are united in purpose and determination to marshal, prepare, and utilize the Nation's resources of men and material in the best and most effective manner for the accomplishment of the purposes for which we have unsheathed the sword.

United as we are in our purpose to assemble and prepare the Nation's resources of men and material for any and every service that may be necessary to the accomplishment of the Nation's will, we have not been and we shall not be captious, contentious, or overinsistent as to the form and fashion of the legislation or the details of the plans or policies intended or necessary to meet the present emergency.

Sums of staggering magnitude have been and will be provided and appropriated to be expended within certain general limitations, largely at the discretion of the President and his immediate advisers. Legislation has been enacted and has been proposed and will be enacted conferring extraordinary and unusual authority on the Executive and the executive departments. Every doubt has been and undoubtedly will be resolved in favor of granting during the emergency the extraordinary powers asked by the executive departments, instead of, as in time of peace, resolving those doubts in favor of withholding or limiting those powers.

CONGRESS SHOULD PERFORM ITS DUTY.

While this has been and undoubtedly will continue to be the attitude of the Congress toward the executive branch of the Government, as it should be in the case of war and emergency, it does not, at least it should not, follow that Congress or its Members should cease to have opinions or express them, should cease to present what they conceive to be the view and attitude of a majority of the people they represent or abdicate their function as a coordinate branch of the Government, elected by and directly responsible to the people. That the entire Congress as the people's representatives is enlisted for the successful and energetic prosecution of the war, upon which many reluctantly entered, has been abundantly proven by votes in this Chamber since the state of war was declared.

It will, however, be a sad day for the Republic should the Representatives in both or either branch of Congress, or a majority of them, become the mere tools and instruments for the recording, validation, and confirmation of every proposal, purpose, or whim of the executive departments of the Government. If there were any who purposed to assume such an attitude on the theory that it was the easiest way, the one least liable to subject them to criticism, they ought in good conscience resign and make way for some one having reasonably the courage of their convictions. I hope there are none such. It is better for the country that a Member of Congress should occasionally be honestly wrong or mistaken than that he should be everlastingly trimming his sails to every fitful breeze that blows, though by so doing he may better weather the squall and by mere accident be occasionally right. [Applause.]

SCOPE OF THE BILL.

Mr. Chairman, these observations have, in my opinion, a very pertinent application to some features of the measures before us. This bill is intended, as declared by its title, "To authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States" and not, as many people seem to have erroneously supposed, to provide a permanent system of military training or service. Many of the questions, therefore, relative to military training and service which have been widely discussed and which the passing and the outcome of the present emergency may suggest or demonstrate as the proper and neces-

sary plan and policy of national defense are not before us for settlement.

Fortunately in this, as in other matters of legislation which have been presented to us since the declaration of war, and as I hope and believe will be the case in the future during this national emergency, we are largely and in the main in agreement. That all who enjoy the blessings of citizenship and residence in the Republic owe obedience to its laws at all times and especial circumspection of conduct in times of stress or emergency is axiomatic. That all males of suitable age and physically fit owe the Nation military service, and should cheerfully and enthusiastically render the same when needed or when called upon by competent authority is a fundamental and essential principle of our national life. That Congress has the power and authority to declare how, when, under what conditions and circumstances, to what extent, and with what exceptions this service shall be called for or demanded, either in preparation for or in actual participation in the national defense and the maintenance of the national honor, few will attempt to and none can reasonably, logically, or successfully deny.

AGREEMENT ON MOST PROVISIONS.

Being thus agreed on fundamentals underlying the proposition of this legislation we are also in agreement on most of its essential features. There are no serious differences of opinion, no differences that can not be adjusted without serious difficulty relative to the Regular Military Establishment or the National Guard heretofore authorized, particularly since the War Department has recently reversed its former decision as to the authority for the organization of new National Guard units.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has once or twice referred in terms of criticism to the opinion of the War Department toward the National Guard. Is it not a fact that the authorization of the new unit of the National Guard rests with the State, and after the States have accepted a unit in the National Guard it then becomes incumbent on the Federal Government to accept the unit and furnish it with supplies called for by the military act?

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad the gentleman has referred to the attitude of the War Department toward volunteer organizations.

Mr. BORLAND. We have been through it repeatedly.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding of the matter is this, that with exceeding reluctance and only under pressure the War Department has admitted that the national defense act authorizes new units of the National Guard, but up to this very hour the War Department has not called for new units and has not received those which have been offered. I understand that 20 States now stand ready to offer new units of the National Guard, which the War Department has made no effort or motion to equip or receive. [Applause.]

I will say further that it is my conviction, based on careful inquiry, that every influence of the Regular Military Establishment of this Government for the last two years and up to this time has been to discredit and discourage voluntary enlistment; that from the time we first began to send the National Guard to the border to this hour the Regular Establishment has opposed voluntary enlistments and done much to discredit and discourage the National Guard and all who have to do with voluntary service in the armies of the Nation. [Applause.] I want to absolve the President of the United States from any participation in or any sympathy with that attitude of the War Department. It is the attitude of the military mind, seeking to form a military instrument which they believe is best suited to their purpose, without regard to the views or opinions or feelings of the people who furnish the soldiers, the people whom you and I represent. [Applause.]

I am glad this question of the attitude of the military authorities toward volunteering has been raised, for it affords an opportunity to refer to a feature of the situation which is exceedingly interesting. Gentlemen who are supporting the War Department bill, in the very same breath in which they say volunteering is out of date, is a failure, ought not to be tried because it is haphazard, unscientific, takes the brave and leaves the slacker, will tell you that, anyway, the authorized increases of the Regular Establishment and the authorized National Guard will afford places for over 700,000 men, and that this will furnish all the opportunity necessary for volunteering.

If volunteering has all the faults they ascribe to it, if its effects are so unfortunate as they paint them, if it is such a failure as they would have us believe, why do not they have the courage of their convictions and apply their misnamed "selective" conscription to these services? Why continue, to

the tune of three-quarters of a million of men, a system they insist is unfair, inequitable, and a failure at that. The fact is, as they know, your real volunteer does not take kindly to the Regular Army. It savors too much of professional soldiering to suit the citizen soldier. He likes to serve with men from his own locality, the boys he has been raised with. The Regular Army places him among strangers and in a strange organization.

As to the opportunities for volunteering in the National Guard are concerned, a persistent effort to discredit the guard and blunders in its management, for which the supply departments are largely responsible, have tended to make that service less attractive than it would otherwise be. Nevertheless, the guard regiments are being filled. As to the new units of the guard, which the War Department has at last reluctantly admitted are authorized by law, no encouragement has been given to raise them, or assurance that they will be equipped if raised, so that this alleged opportunity for volunteer enlistment is, to a large extent, a myth, and will continue to be unless the War Department radically changes its attitude. The fact is, however, that, in spite of these conditions of discouragement rather than encouragement, 30 thousand men have joined the Regular Army in about half that many days, besides the naval recruits and the filling of the National Guard units in the States.

POINTS OF DIFFERENCE.

The differences so far as they exist among us relate, in the main, to the new and additional forces which the President is specifically authorized by this bill to organize and equip. Even as to these forces and the procedure proposed in the provisions of the bill providing for them we are largely in agreement. We are agreed as to the size of this force. It is to consist of a half a million men in the first unit, and an additional half million, in the discretion of the President, and in addition such recruiting units as the President may deem necessary for the maintenance of such forces at maximum strength. We are agreed that there shall be registration of all persons liable to military service within the ages that may be agreed upon and as to the manner of that registration.

Now, as to our differences. The bill before us reported by the Military Committee of the House provides for the registration of all male citizens, or males who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 40, inclusive. The proposal of the minority based on the recommendation of the War Department, approved as I understand it, reluctantly I hope, by the President, is to enroll only those between the ages of 19 and 25, inclusive. I understand that the Secretary of War has estimated the duration of this period of enrollment and registration at three months, which is probably the minimum time that would be required, after which, as proposed by the department bill, there is to be a draft or conscription by selection of a sufficient number of those registered to make up the authorized forces.

The bill before us, however, provides that these forces may be raised at once by volunteers between the ages of 18 and 40, or "upon the completion of the enrollment provided in this act, and in the event the President decides that such additional force or forces shall not have been effectively raised under the call for volunteers" the President may raise the additional and necessary forces by draft under the enrollment of men between the ages of 21 and 40, which the bill authorizes.

It will be seen that the important and essential differences between the bill before us and the recommendation of the War Department, approved by the President, are two in number: First, the scope of enrollment; second, whether there shall be a trial of volunteering. There has been much said of late as to the duty and liability of military service. That such duty and liability is at one and the same time one of the highest privileges and greatest responsibilities of a citizen of a free country there can be little difference of opinion; and in the case of the country's dire need the duty and responsibility begins with the dawning of manhood and only ceases with the coming of the infirmities of old age. Such duty should, however, never be imposed as an unnecessary burden in peace, and only as the welfare of the Nation may require, or in war, except to the extent that the maintenance of the independence or the liberties of the people may demand and the honor of the Nation and the protection of its citizens may require.

LIABILITY NOT CONFINED TO ONE CLASS.

When the need comes and the call is made, whether for volunteers or, if need be, conscripts, it should afford the opportunity and lay the duty upon all of sound and mature manhood, and never under any circumstances upon one class or those who happen to be of a certain limited range of age,

Why should volunteers, or even conscripts, exclude all above 25 years of age? By what perversion of the theory of universal liability and duty does the War Department propose to conscript boys of 19 and drag them from their homes and absolve men of 26 and upward from all obligations of service?

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that there should be a draft and that the first draft should include only those between 19 and 25, what possible excuse can there be, when we are going forth to enroll the Nation for military service, for not enrolling all of the mature, active, and efficient ages between 21 and 40? Is it the purpose of those supporting the bill approved by the military authorities to serve notice on the country that the burden of this war, of the fighting and the dying, is all to be borne, so far as the new forces are concerned, by the boys and young men of 19 to 25, and thus secure support for their plan of all men above 25? If that is not their purpose, why do they insist on enrolling at the beginning of a war that may require millions of men only the boys under age and a few years beyond? If I believed conscription necessary at this moment, I would resign my place on this floor and go home to my people before I would vote to conscript and take from their mothers and their families boys of 19 years of age, and yet this is what we are asked to do.

It is true gentlemen will say that is not in the bill now and that they are not standing for it. At the same time they are standing before the country pretending that they are upholding the War Department and the President. Upon nothing did the War Department insist more strenuously than upon the plan that was to lay the whole burden of this mighty conflict in its inception on boys and men 19 to 25 years of age. Under their plan all above 25, good citizens and slackers alike, would be able to lay the soothing unction to their souls that the Congress of the United States had absolved them from all obligation to serve their country in this great conflict, and that is what the gentlemen call providing for universal service. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman is an experienced legislator, and I would like to have his construction of one portion of this bill. In the bill before the House, which is the same for the majority and the minority side, providing for conscription between the ages of 21 and 40, there is provision that the draft shall be made under regulations made by the department. I would like to know whether the gentleman's construction is that the department can group the persons between 21 and 40 into classes and draw exclusively from any one of those classes?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before I answer the gentleman's question, if he will allow me, I would suggest that if the minority, the gentlemen who want to leave it all to the War Department, and say they are following the President, have come to accept the enrollment ages of 21 to 40, which the committee has placed in the bill instead of the ages of 19 to 25, for which the department contended, it is proof that they have learned something since this debate began, and that even they are no longer following the department's view.

Now, answering the gentleman's question, I would say that under the terms of the bill the department might group the enrolled men according to ages and draw their conscripts from a certain group. In fact, that is what the General Staff seem to have had in mind for in the New York American of the 17th of this month John Temple Graves, a well-known writer, who stands well with the departments of this Government, on the front page of that paper, in a signed article, says that he was informed by General Staff officers that it was their purpose to conscript the entire first unit of 500,000 from boys under 20 years of age. That would take about all the able-bodied boys of that age in the country. What a beautiful demonstration of democracy and universal service that would be. Whether John Temple Graves had authority for that statement so set forth in a great newspaper under his name I do not know, but my opinion is that he echoed exactly the sentiments of the War Department; that they proposed and intended to conscript 500,000 boys from the high schools and colleges and homes of the country, leaving the balance of the population, with regard to military obligations that these gentlemen prate so loudly about, entirely free to continue their present safe and gainful occupations.

VOLUNTEERING VERSUS CONSCRIPTION.

The bill before us proposes to begin volunteering at once, meanwhile enrolling for service and for conscription if it should become necessary all men between the ages of 21 and 40. In the three or four months before enrollment is complete and the first men could be secured under conscription, we would undoubtedly obtain a goodly number of volunteers. We certainly would unless those of us who believed it our duty in accordance with the recommendation of the President to take up the gage

of battle Germany has thrown down were mistaken in the attitude of the American people toward the incidents and acts which we believed made war inevitable. At any rate, whatever number of volunteers were secured would be that much gained in time and opportunity for training and preparation, and if volunteering continued as rapidly as we could provide for training, furnish arms and uniforms, there would be no necessity for conscription.

If at any time under the terms of this bill the President decides that the forces provided for can not be effectively raised and maintained under the call for volunteers he may resort to the draft, and he will then have enrolled for the purposes of that draft not three and one-half or four million available boys under age and men under 25, 1 at least out of every 3 or 4 of whom he would be compelled to conscript, but twenty to twenty-five million of mature men between the ages of 21 and 40 only 1 in 20 of whom need be called to the colors. If a draft should become necessary and conscription is wise and proper, as some contend, how much fairer, how much more reasonable, how much better from every viewpoint would be a conscription selecting 1 out of 20 in the first instance from the entire body of our efficient manhood than 1 out of every 3 or 4 of the boys and the very young men.

HOW WE HAVE VIEWED IT IN THE PAST.

But I can not refrain from a very few observations relative to conscription. I may be old fashioned; no doubt I am; at any rate I can not forget nor can I bring myself to wholly discredit the teachings and exhortations of the scholars, statesmen, and orators of all our history even amid the necessary and inevitable excitement and hysteria of a world war. I can not forget that it has been our boast and glory in the past that volunteers gained the independence of the Republic, maintained its rights against the encroachments of the mistress of the seas, won for us the great southwest, and in the most awful struggle of history prior to the present war saved and cemented the Union. [Applause.]

A long line of statesmen, scholars, and orators have testified to the value, enlarged upon the glory, and extolled the triumphs and virtues of volunteer service, and on printed page in legislative hall, from stump and platform have dwelt with pride and spoken with enthusiasm upon our blessed freedom from the exactions, the burdens, the interferences, the restraints and the annoyances which are the inevitable accompaniment of the most reasonably and considerately administered system of conscription.

I have not time to even refer to the mass of sophistries, to the perfect flood of crooked and inverted logic which has been deluged on the country in an effort to convince people that the thing which we have always abhorred and which at any time or under any conditions is at best an unfortunate necessity to be borne with fortitude because of its necessity is in a fact a great and glorious blessing. Conscription may be an unfortunate necessity before this war is over. Let us therefore prepare a broad rather than a narrow foundation for that contingency, but let us not endeavor to delude ourselves into the belief that compulsory military service is in itself a blessing.

IS PRUSSIA DEMOCRATIC?

Conscription has been widely heralded as being democratic. If it is, Germany and Austria are the most democratic countries on the earth, and Prussia is the one perfect and unrivaled fruit and flower of democracy, for Prussia was not only the mother of modern conscription, but she has developed and practiced it more completely and continuously than any nation on earth. Her universal service under conscription and the all-powerful military system and overbearing military caste which the system created was the natural, inevitable, and direct cause of the war, which, having devastated all Europe and a considerable part of Asia, has brought the new world within the circle of its devouring flame.

I am not surprised that men high in military rank, professional soldiers, have indorsed conscription, nor do I blame them for doing so from the purely military view. To one who desires a destructive instrument of gigantic power, instantly available when fully organized for any purpose for which its master wills to use it, there is nothing that compares to a nation enrolled, trained, and accustomed to universal conscript service. Every tyrant and usurper, every professional conqueror, every despoiler of the liberties of the people since time began, from the days of Belshazzar along the bloody trail traveled by the hordes of Gengis Khan to William Hohenzollern, has been a conscriptor and a firm believer in the virtues and efficiency of universal and selective conscription.

And yet I would not speak too harshly of conscription, for even democracies have sometimes, when their resources were drained to the limit, been compelled to resort to it, as we did

in the latter part of the Civil War, with much rioting and meager results.

VOLUNTEERING NOT A FAILURE.

It is loudly proclaimed, with little regard for the facts of history, that volunteering has been a failure. That is no nearer the truth than it would be to say that democracy has been a failure because autocracy and absolutism in Germany have proven wonderfully efficient. Under volunteering we raised all but 61,000 of the millions of men who fought in the Civil War. Under volunteer enlistment England raised, equipped, and trained, after the war began, more than 5,000,000 men—all of her troops who fought the victorious battle of the Marne and the great majority of those who are now fighting so valiantly and successfully in France and Flanders. To-day these English-speaking volunteers—Scotch, Welsh, Irish, English—are beating back the conscript soldiers of the Kaiser. [Applause.] Under a volunteer system Canada, with one-tenth our population, has raised and sent overseas nearly half as many men as we propose under this bill to give the President authority to enroll.

If you ask me, "What is the surest and most effective weapon or instrument for a tyrant, an autocrat, a usurper," I shall say unhesitatingly, "A force conscripted under universal service." If the question be as to the best kind of an army to fight the battles of a free people, I adhere to the opinion that it is a universally trained citizenship serving freely and voluntarily.

WHAT IS SELECTIVE CONSCRIPTION?

Conscription did not lose the ugly significance that has always attached to it until some master craftsman of sophistry coined the magic term "selective conscription," when, presto, change, the miracle was wrought and conscription passed from things abhorred to the category of things approved and embraced. [Applause.]

For selective conscription until actually applied is anything and everything you desire it to be. You may picture it the instrument of omnipotence, omniscience, and infinite disinterestedness and fairness, selecting those best suited, best qualified, and best equipped to serve. Your fancy may conjure a picture in which unanimous approval of those who go and those who remain shall wait upon the outcome. Your interest, your partiality, or your affection may present to you a selection which leaves safely at home those whose services at home are valuable to you, those whose shrinking from hard service you sympathize with or those you love. But unfortunately we shall not have the service of infinite wisdom or virtue, for our instruments of selection will be human, and at the best we could not hope to be free from faults of judgment, from prejudice, from favoritism, or even more serious faults or frailties. In any event, if the selection is to be from the comparatively limited number proposed to be enrolled under the War Department's plan, one in three of all those enrolled must go, however the selection be made.

We have not yet been enlightened as to the details of the proposed selections. The War Department tells us they have not worked them out, but a wide discretion in exemptions is allowed.

The bill authorizes the exemption from conscription or draft of customhouse clerks, persons employed in the transmission of the mails, workmen in armories, arsenals, and navy yards, all in the service of the United States, whom the President may designate, American seamen, and finally and all-embracing "persons engaged in industries found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment or the effective operation of the military forces during the emergency." If all these are exempted from this selective draft, who is to go?

High-school and college youths, clerks, youths who have not yet demonstrated that they are invaluable in some particular enterprise or occupation. Under such a plan in some communities and some occupations, pursuits, and enterprises all must be selected, or practically so, and in other communities, other occupations, other pursuits, few or none will be called or chosen. All this is proposed, as I understand it, on the theory of democracy and universal liability to service.

It is insisted that volunteering is unfair, inequitable, unjust, in that under it the brave, the impulsive, the ardent, the enterprising, the venturesome, the conscientious, the patriotic serve and suffer while the cowardly, the indifferent, the selfish, the unpatriotic, the whole brood of slackers remain safely and securely at home. This is all true and regrettable; but how much will it be cured by selective conscription, under which the slacker in every form and guise will fairly smother the enrolling board with oaths and affidavits as to their unfitness or their disabilities on the one hand, or the indispensable character of their services to some essential industry of production, manufacture, or transportation on the other. On the other hand, those who are of the material of which volunteers

are made, if their spirits are not crushed and their enthusiasm dampened or extinguished by the thought of conscription, will employ every argument and use every artifice to secure their acceptance. Which of these, think you, will, in the main, find their names on the muster roll? How many of a class of enthusiastic, patriotic college boys would seek to or would escape the draft? How many among the enrolled trapper boys or young miners or young farmer or village boys from my State would fall of enrollment among the conscripts? You say they would go, anyway, if they had a chance, and gladly; and so they would, many of them, and I want to give them a chance as volunteers and not as conscripts. [Applause.]

TO SUM IT UP.

In conclusion, let us sum up and see wherein our differences lie. You want an enrollment as the basis of conscription. We are with you for such an enrollment in order that we may know our resources of men and in order that we may draw on them as may be necessary. You desire to have that enrollment narrow, limited, confined to youths and men in their earliest manhood. We would begin our enrollment with men of legal age and full maturity and embrace within it all vigorous manhood up to 40. You would draft and draft only from your restricted class and absolve the bulk of the male population from all obligation of service. We would call on all of military age who desired to serve and receive them as honored volunteers into their country's service. Your plan may have the approval of the military mind. It may even have the recent and grudging approval of the President, burdened as he is with innumerable problems and surrounded as he must be at a time like this with men taking the purely professional military view of matters, but our plan has, or will have when fully understood, the approval of the hearts and consciences of the great body of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN: Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HEINTZ].

Mr. HEINTZ: Mr. Chairman, I have attentively listened, and have endeavored to follow, with no little difficulty, the reasoning of the majority. They start with saying that conscription is wrong, undemocratic, and wholly unjustifiable. They say they will not surrender to the request of the Secretary of War and of the General Staff their constitutional duty as representatives of the people to combat to the last this "autocratic" war measure. They refuse to grant to the Army the right to advise in any degree in this emergency. They say that the volunteer system of raising an army must be maintained, because it is of the very foundation on which our Nation is built.

And yet, in section 1, paragraph 3, you expressly give the President the right to exercise the draft—later on. You deny him the right under the circumstances as they exist to-day. You say it is your constitutional and patriotic duty to stand firmly against his request. And in the same breath you express a willingness to completely surrender the duty to the President, to be exercised by him a month or two months or three months after this bill is signed, and that under circumstances that may be exactly the same as those existing to-day, under the rules and conditions to be prescribed by the President, and he need not then even so much as consult you.

How do you explain the readiness to abandon this constitutional duty? Can what is autocratic and subversive of democracy to-day become democratic and American through the lapse of a few days? What is asked of you now you deny, but you are willing to grant to another the right to exercise the power hereafter, under circumstances which you can not foresee and over which you can have no control. Do you contend that what is fundamentally autocratic now will be fundamentally democratic then, or is it a plain case of what, in the language of the street, is called "passing the buck" and placing the responsibility of the final decision on the President?

Long before the opening of this special session of Congress I advocated a plan of raising an army, somewhat similar to the plan contained in the majority report. Even then I had not much faith in our ability to get an army by a call for volunteers, and I was always sensible to the fact that such plan was undemocratic, inefficient, wasteful, and wholly unjust.

But two considerations caused me to advocate a call for volunteers for a sufficiently long period before putting conscription into effect, and they were, first, to give due consideration to the convictions of the large number of sincere citizens who are eager for a volunteer army, and to prove to them conclusively, once and for all, the utter impracticability of such plan; and second, to give to the large number of able-bodied citizens between 25 and 40 years of age, who have shouted loudest for preparedness and for "universal" training, and indeed for war itself, an opportunity to prove their patriotism by action as well as by high-sounding words, and to demon-

strate their readiness to make personal physical sacrifice for the cause which they have so vociferously espoused.

But I have seen sufficient of the failure of the volunteer plan not to be willing to sacrifice time, nor to deviate from a firm conviction, in order only to further demonstrate its absolute futility. I saw its failure at the time of the call for Mexico last June. At that time those who were recruiting and those who were urged to enlist universally thought that the mission was to be real warfare in Mexico and not border duty only. Not only did the average citizen of military age refuse to enlist last June, but many who were above 25 and under 40, who had boasted of their military efficiency and who had received a certain amount of training at a considerable expense to the Government in money and in effort, gave deaf ear to the call.

In commenting upon those men from the Plattsburg training camps, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], on the floor of the Senate on April 11, 1917, said—I quote from page 432 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I understand that this kind of military training is very effective. Now, why not make these men one of the military assets? The only way we can do it is by having some form, some measure, of enlistment. That has been proved by the fact that when we were asking for men to go into the Army in Mexico it is said that probably less than half a dozen out of the 30,000, or maybe more than 30,000, trained went from the Plattsburg camp. Now, my idea is that when we spend this money, especially as it is the law, we ought to uphold the law and ought to uphold the best interests of our country by having some measure of enlistment so that we can take advantage of it now that we need them.

In my own vicinity there are about 140 graduates of these military training camps. Last June, when my home regiment was expecting to be sent to Mexico, I communicated with each of these cadets, most of whom are between the ages of 25 and 40, calling his attention to his duty to join the colors at once. I told them then that the time for words had passed, that the President had called for their services, and that it had come to the show-down. Only four out of the entire number responded, and these offered excuses for not joining the colors.

In the last two weeks I again addressed these young men, asking each one if he would enlist in case the volunteer plan of raising an army was decided upon, and of those who deigned to answer all replied in the negative except four. Do not lose sight of the fact that these are men of standing in their community, enjoying more than average incomes, physically capable, and who, when not talking about their own military training, were talking about preparedness generally. In fact, between talking privately and publically they were talking about all the time. I have no desire to bring contumely upon the heads of these young men who must, at least, be free of any abnormal craving for personal action, but I do purpose to state in no unmistakable language the present condition and the present state of mind of no small part of our people. If anything more were needed to prove the utter folly of wasting more time seeking volunteers, I might add that the condition just indicated is equally as prevalent among the general citizenship between the ages of 25 and 40—I do not know about the boys under 25, as they appear not to have been consulted—as it is among the representative young men just referred to, only among the more silent citizens it does not stand out so conspicuously.

Before passing, I wish to place in the RECORD the names of the four patriotic young men that stand out with such exceptional luster. Arthur Meyer, of Sayler Park; Russell Rankin, of Cincinnati; Charles Howe, of Covington; and Herbert Weil, of Cincinnati. And it may not be amiss to observe that one-half of the names are of Germanic origin.

I ask of those who advocate calling for volunteers, Whom do you expect to volunteer? I have yet to hear one of them say that he himself will be the first to offer his services. This conflict is not a war for the vindication of national rights and honor solely. We have been attacked and, at its foundation, it is a struggle for the home and family of every one of us. Are you who are asking for volunteers going to volunteer yourself, or are you simply asking some one else to volunteer to fight the battle for you and those who have the right to your protection?

Every hour that we devote to the endeavor of raising a volunteer army just that much longer is our country to remain standing still and uncommitted to any fixed plan, exposed and helpless. We are at war, and war to me means, and always has meant, not merely the passing of resolutions and making of speeches, but actual physical fighting, and we can not fight without men and equipment and hard training. The month that might mean victory or downfall when the time comes for the supreme effort may be in process of being lost at this very moment.

The service which I favor is a truly universal service. Not one that is "universal" for the other fellow and "exclusive"

of one's self. If it is to be a burden and a hardship, why should it be saddled entirely upon the boys of tender years, especially when they have not been taken into our counsel and in no manner consulted as to their wishes? If, on the contrary, military service is to be a great benefit to its recipients, as is often stated by those between 25 and 40, why not make a more democratic distribution of it, as most men over 25 will no doubt be found to be more lacking and more needful of disciplinary training than those under that age?

I entirely agree that industrial preparation and industrial service are just as important as military endeavor, but it should be made universal in all departments of preparation and service and required of all men of military or industrial availability, whether their ages be 20, 25, 35, 40, or, indeed, 45. They all should be included within the provision of the conscription act, and the properly designated authorities should decide of their availability and in what branch of the service they can be of the greatest help. The wealthy flaneur and idler between 25 and 45 should be placed as firmly within the hold of the law as the shiftless loafer of the same age, and as well as the industrious student or artisan of youthful years. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to vote against the volunteer provision of this bill, much as I dislike to oppose the recommendations of the majority of the Military Committee. I have the utmost confidence in the high purpose of these gentlemen and appreciate greatly the courage and patriotism they have shown in defending this provision in their bill, even in the face of the opposition of the metropolitan press that has fallen into the habit lately of impugning the motive of Members of Congress who follow their own convictions.

I will support the President in this matter because I am convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the volunteer system is not only absolutely unjust, unbusinesslike and immoral, but in addition thereto would prove a dismal failure in the end. I would support the President in his plans as Commander in Chief of the Army, even though I had some doubt of the wisdom of some features of the bill for the reason that good business practice has proven that the chief in command should not have his plans weakened by being forced to accept compromises that in his judgment would make success doubtful. The President has been chosen by the people as their Commander in Chief. The people through their representatives have declared war. The President is in command and is responsible for his own acts to the people. My view is that so far as his military operations are concerned he should have full swing. To give the President what he thinks he needs, to do what we have by law directed him to do, is in my judgment sound business sense.

I am not of those who shout "stand up for the President" in times of peace and thereby abrogate the power of the people to speak through their representatives, but in time of war the man the people choose to command should be supported in matters he deems necessary to the success of the enterprise we have engaged upon. Aside from these sound reasons for supporting the President's war measures, I offer other arguments that seem to me unanswerable against the volunteer system, which is the bone of contention in the committee bill before this House, among which are the following:

First, the obligation of citizenship bears upon all alike. The universal liability of citizens to taxes for the support of the Government has been used by gentlemen in this debate to prove the equal liability of the citizen to military service. The analogy is perfectly proper and unanswerable, and I have heard no supporter of the volunteer system attempt to answer this argument. No matter what our practices in applying this principle in raising armies have been in the past, no one disputes that this obligation is universal. We recognize it generally in levying burdens on our citizens for the support of the Government. In times of peace the material burden of government consists largely of a tax in some form or another for raising revenues. This tax rate is always uniform upon a class of citizens or a kind of business and is never left to chance or the whims of patriotism of the citizen. It is an obligation the citizen owes, and the tax is a levy against him. He is not asked to volunteer his taxes. If he were asked to adopt such a volunteer system for tax purposes, and the life of the Government had to depend to-day on such an asinine system for raising the seven billions of dollars we have appropriated for war expenditures, I fear we would be utterly lost under such a plan. One only needs to apply the volunteer system to the revenue proposition to fully appreciate its weakness and danger to the Government if actually put into practice. Therefore, if it is unfair to the people and a weakness to the Government to be depend-

ent upon volunteers for a mere material support, how are we to justify a demand that the real patriots of the country volunteer a blood offering for its defense. To me the proposition of volunteers can not possibly be sustained on the ground of fairness and common decency.

The second reason for rejecting the volunteer system is it is not patriotic and has proven a national disgrace in actual practice in the case of the Civil War. In that great struggle for national unity we enlisted a total of slightly over two and three-quarters millions of men. Of this number 51 per cent, or about one and one-third millions, were boys from 10 to 19 years of age and only—mark the number—about 300,000 who had reached mature years of 22 and over. That is what the volunteer system brought us in a time of great stress. It was a national disgrace to rob the schools to get the boys to save the life of the country. Only about 300,000 men above the age of 22 could be found—and many of them had to be drafted—who loved their country well enough to fight for it; that is, before they sacrificed their sons first.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. SHALLENBERGER, in a splendid oratorical effort yesterday soared around the mountain slopes of the Alps paying high tribute to that splendid people who have maintained the standard of liberty there for a thousand years, leaving the inference that these people were free because of the volunteer system. As a matter of fact they are free for the opposite reason. These people no doubt owe their national existence to-day to the fact that under a system of universal service a Swiss Army of nearly a half million was mobilized on the borders of that little republic within 48 hours after the great war broke out. The Swiss did not rob the schools of the boys to make this army either. It was an army of brave and mature men that did not skulk behind a volunteer system. Picture this volunteer system at work in all its alleged glory during the dark days of the Civil War. You can see the recruiting stands in every city and village in the land. At first they had only a fife and drum to call attention of the needs of the country for men. The flag was floating and the martial music attracted the boys. A colored picture of valiant men in battle was pasted on the wall back of the recruiting officer. The farm boys left their teams at the hitching racks and joined the Army. The school boys in their first long pants left their classes, the boys in the shops and stores responded to the call until a mighty host of over 1,000,000 responded with the enthusiasm of youth, without counting the cost, to their country's need. The recruiting officer winked when they lied about their ages so as to be old enough to come under the requirements. There was an age limit during the Civil War, but under the volunteer system a small matter of age limit did not trouble the local captain who must have his company recruited to full strength. They had a natural right to be allowed to grow up to be equipped for life with an education before being sent into a long and bloody war.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman care to yield there?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. As I understand it so frequent was the habit of young men overstating their age in order to enlist during the Civil War that the Pension Department will not even accept the enlistment age as prima facie evidence of a man's age when he enlisted.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I think that is true.

I repeat, it was a national disgrace and ought to bring the blush of shame to every true American to know that his country actually robbed the schools to get an army to fight for able-bodied men who stayed at home. That is the volunteer system in all of its alleged glory as it worked out in practice.

By and by the fife and drum were not sufficient to get men for recruiting the wasted ranks of the boys sent to the front. The boys were all gone except those that were growing up to the volunteering age, so a band had to be hired and public meetings had to be held to urge men to enlist. The slackers had to be snubbed by their friends, questioned in church, and insulted in public places to remind them of the universal obligation of citizenship. A leading citizen had to get on a dry-goods box in front of the recruiting office and make a plea for men to join the colors. The slackers avoided these places as they would a pestilence, but the honest, patriotic boys were caught like flies in a trap as fast as they got into long pants.

But the tug of war came on when the last call resulted in the draft. The men who had resisted snubs and insults because they would not volunteer now came face to face with a draft to go. They and their unpatriotic friends in certain localities resisted the draft, and riots occurred, but finally enough were drafted of mature men to raise the total of men over 22 in that great army of nearly 3,000,000 up to about 300,000. It is one of the most disgraceful spectacles that is afforded in American

history, and I sincerely hope that we will not again make such a sacrifice of our schoolboys and our own self-respect by adopting the system of volunteering that has so signally humiliated us.

THE DRAFT RIOTS AN ARGUMENT FOR DRAFT.

The draft riots brought about by the slackers and their friends is offered as an argument against selective draft. Who was it that objected to draft? Was it the patriotic army at the front or their families at home? Not at all. It was the contemptuous citizens and their followers at home who were so devoid of manhood and common decency or for other reasons that they were callous to the opinions of the community as to their duty to enlist, who caused the draft riots. They should have been thrown into prison and tried for their lives for treason against their country in resisting the draft.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LOBECK. The reason why we had the draft at that time was because there were a number of people in the North who did not agree with Abraham Lincoln's policy.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. I think that is true.

Mr. LOBECK. It was the Knights of the Golden Circle and the copperheads in the North who caused those riots.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. That is true.

Mr. LOBECK. The young men who were patriotic went, and so did the older men. Now, the statement the gentleman put in there does not agree with history at that time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. To offer the draft riots as an argument against the draft is to accept the standard of citizenship set by the most unpatriotic class of citizens and reject the standard of honor and citizenship set by the patriots who offered their services at their country's call, believing all able-bodied men needed would follow them. In the light of the facts of history no one can successfully contend that the draft should be rejected because a lot of disloyal slackers did not like the system. The men who did the fighting rejoiced that the Government finally had resorted to a method that would force the slacker into the ranks.

It is true the drafted man was in disgrace in the Army, and naturally so, because he had been driven in at the last hour. But that is no argument against the draft. Had the draft been ordered at the beginning of the war the boys would have been allowed to grow up and finish their school work. The men of the country would have accepted their share of the responsibility of citizenship as a matter of fact. The draft levy would have been accepted as just by the people, just as they accepted their tax levy. But to have to apply the draft the last year of the war was conclusive proof that it ought to have been applied at the very beginning. Then all the travail of the struggle for volunteers and the draft riots would have been avoided.

The third reason for rejecting the volunteer system is that it is impractical at this time because it is too slow. A great army is needed at once. It can not be even enlisted, in my judgment, under the volunteer system in a year, if at all, and then another year would be required in training it. One only needs to examine the experience of England, even in the face of imminent danger to the life of the nation, to see how burdensome is the work of clubbing men into volunteering. Clubbing is what it amounts to in effect, and besides that it requires an immense force of men and tremendous publicity to get together a volunteer army. There can be no advantage in the spirit of men who volunteer under such circumstances over those who are drafted, for the man himself, if he is forced by public sentiment to join the Army, feels no better about it than he would if drafted, just as the Government drafts his tax money. We are at war with Germany. The Congress has pledged all of its resources and all of its efforts to bring it to a successful conclusion. Now, do we propose to piddle along here a year to raise this army under the volunteer system and at the end of the year find we have again enlisted an army of immature boys? Or are we going to accept the selective draft system and secure an army ready to be trained within three or four months? The success of this war may depend upon the rapidity with which we create an effective army. Why go to war at all if we are not going to efficiently prosecute it?

The fourth reason for rejecting the volunteer system is that it is uneconomical. An army can be raised by selective draft in three or four months at a nominal cost, if war cost can ever be said to be nominal, while under the volunteer system millions on top of millions will be spent in one form or another in giving publicity to the need of the country for volunteers. This expense will string out over a long period of time, as is shown by the rate of enlistments at the present time, even in the heat of the war excitement, when the response is greater than it will be later, unless something happens at sea to stir the country to action. It will take so much money to drum

up this volunteer army and consume so much time that we will furnish an example to the world of the inefficiency of democracy, and in the end might find our allies in this war crushed. Then, indeed, would we have to adopt a businesslike system that would get results. It might be too late to save us from great humiliation at the hands of an efficient enemy that might put us to the greatest possible effort to defend ourselves.

THE SELECTIVE DRAFT WILL CONSERVE PRODUCTION.

There is no doubt in my own mind that the selective draft will work the greatest possible advantage to the country. It recognizes the necessity of mobilizing our full strength in this war by conserving all the sources of production. The war is not fought alone by men on the firing line, but it is fought equally by all the industries that are furnishing the men on the firing line with arms, ammunition, and all the materials needed for waging war. The selective draft system will take into account the need of greater production of food and will not rob the farms and factories of men needed to feed and supply the men in arms. It will also recognize the need of dependent families and not rob them of the men to support them. In fact, the selective draft system contemplates leaving men undisturbed who are engaged in occupations that are directly serving the needs of the country. They are filling honorable places in the scheme of war. The men unattached who are not actively engaged in production and who have no dependents will naturally be called first to do their bit where they can best serve. It is a sensible and economic arrangement and is certain to be approved by the people as just and fair and calculated to put the Nation in the best possible state of defense.

NEED OF A FOOD SUPPLY.

The need of foodstuffs will be the greatest need of the country in this war and it will be the most difficult to supply. Therefore the selective draft will greatly encourage food productions by excluding men engaged in food production from the firing line. The farmers in the great grain belt of the country are so highly skilled that their place can not be taken by men who have not been trained in agriculture.

The selective draft properly applied will save the trained men on our farms for food production, while the volunteer system will produce the great bulk of enlistments from the farm. The urban and country population in my own district is about equal, but up to the present time the indications are that twice as many farm boys are enlisting as city boys. This ratio can reasonably be counted upon to prevail under the volunteer system, because it has been the experience of the Nation in the past. The great Army of the Civil War was made up very largely of farmers. There were no speculators, traders, and war traffickers among the farmers then and there are none now. They did not hang around the moving armies to make money or stay at home and enjoy the business prosperity caused by war. They shouldered muskets and fought for the country, generally, while tradesmen, generally, did not. Therefore I repeat that if the volunteer system prevails we will again witness an army of farm boys with enough city-bred men among them to leaven the loaf, and as a result the country will go hungry.

A great metropolitan newspaper made an inquiry among Members of Congress as to their attitude toward admitting Chinamen to this country to work our farms during this war, so as to insure a bountiful supply of foodstuffs. This inquiry is an indication of the sort of ignorance that prevails among city-bred men as to the sort of skill required by the farm hands on an average American farm in the grain belt. The average number of horses that is handled by one man on the farm in a team is from four to six, and to handle such a team successfully requires years of training. To place such a team in the hands of a Chinaman who probably never handled a horse in his life would be the height of stupidity. It is not only impossible for such a man to handle such a team, but it would be equally impossible for him to control the machine the team draws. The metropolitan editor who thinks he has struck upon a solution of our food trouble by employing Chinese is no more stupid than the man who thinks the boys from the city can be used successfully on the farms. There has been a suggestion that these city boys, too young to enlist, can be drafted and sent to the farms to take the place of the farmers who go to the war. The suggestion is another delusion. But even if it could be put into effect it would prove a failure. These boys might be used to open gates, slop the pigs, bring up the cows from the pasture, carry water to the men in the fields, but to contend that boys under military age who never handled a horse, or a machine, or a modern farm power tractor, could go onto the farm and handle such an outfit and take the place of skilled men is quite absurd. One only needs to venture onto a farm in the great food belt of the West and witness the magnitude of these operations to see how long it would take

to train such boys to be farmers. If it takes trained Army officers a year to teach a body of recruits the goose step and make them fit to meet an enemy, it will take five years to teach a city-bred man, who has never had any farm training, to be a successful food producer.

Another example of the ignorance displayed by the metropolitan press is shown by the following excerpt from an editorial:

SEND LOAFERS TO THE FARMS.

The bread line and soup house in every large city can be reduced, if not entirely eliminated by rigorous legislation forcing able-bodied vagrants and slackers into the country to work on farms.

The strong arm of the State should be used to sweep these beggars out of the cities and into the ranks of farm hands. The rule for sturdy men should be the rule enforced by John Smith at the founding of Jamestown: "He that will not work shall not eat."

Could any suggestion be more stupid or more insulting to the farmers of America than this? Why send this scum of the earth to the farmers? Why not put them in banks, stores, and factories? The skill required to be a bank clerk, storekeeper, or a factory worker is not one whit greater than that required to be a farmer. It is a scurvy return to make the farmers of this country, whose boys are the first to enlist, to suggest sending to them to occupy the vacant chairs of their absent sons the floating derelicts of human society produced in the cities. To send such debased creatures to isolated farms, among the women and children left behind, to be besmirched by their presence in their homes, is as inhuman and brutal as the outrage of the Belgians by the German Army. That is the ethical side, and is sufficient; but the practical side is none the less asinine. These derelicts have never learned to work at all. They are droppings of the society of the great cities. They are as utterly unfit for the farm as would be a horde of savages from the African jungle.

The clamor of the press for greater food production is long and loud, but it is incapable of results. There will be no trouble about food production at present prices if the men are not taken from the farms. We can cry for greater production till we are blue in the face, and not an acre more crop will be planted. That is not the way to get the acreage planted. Robbing the farms of trained farmers will not do it. The way is perfectly clear to me. If the farmer boys are chosen by selective draft, give them an honorable discharge and leave them on their farms. They will do their full part if they will feed the men we have on the firing line. It is just as patriotic to produce the things that make it possible for an army to exist as it is to fight in the ranks. One is absolutely dependent on the other. This argument is true also of every industry in the country that requires skilled men. Labor in shops and factories is infinitely more difficult to obtain than are men for the firing line. To take such men who are needed to produce supplies for the army in the form of ammunition and clothing and leave untrained men idle would show how incompetent we are and how unfit to manage the people's business with economy and dispatch.

Oh, but it is claimed that it is not fair to let the skilled, high-salaried man in the shop escape the dangers of the firing line and make the unskilled do the fighting. The answer to that argument is that there is more theory than fact in it. Some industries have almost as great a casualty list as did most of the wars we have fought in the past. A railroad locomotive brotherhood insurance company, for example, shows a casualty list much greater than any war we have ever waged in the past, and probably greater than that of any war we will ever have, even in these days of destructiveness. Men lose their lives in great numbers in every industry and tens of thousands are injured annually. The difference in the danger to life and limb between the two services—war and industries—whatever it may be, is compensated for by the honor, experience, and opportunity for advancement that comes to the soldier who takes the greater risk to life and limb.

It was currently reported around the Capitol that a survey was made by the police department of the available men suitable for the Army service on a single street in this city, and that it disclosed 1,400 young men without employment and who can generally be found in moving-picture shows each afternoon. I have no doubt that such a state of affairs exists, judging from my own observations. It not only exists here but probably in every city in this land. Is there anyone who believes that the welfare of this Nation will be best served by leaving this large mass of idlers, mere barnacles on society, to occupy space and consume food they do not earn, while we rob the farms, shops, and channels of commerce of skilled labor to fill up the Army with which to wage this war and thereby make futile our efforts to sustain ourselves? I have received many letters from the great States of New York and Massachusetts urging that these idlers and slackers be saved from draft. I receive these appeals with the same respect that I would receive an appeal from a man who wanted to go into the business of robbery and therefore did not want any laws passed to hamper that business.

Robbing is no more dishonorable than dodging one's duty to his country in time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes more?

Mr. KAHN. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman. Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. War while it lasts is the biggest and most complex business in which man ever engages. A country goes to war for the purpose of maintaining its honor, its rights, and its very existence as a free people. Therefore the stake is so great all civil laws may be suspended when necessary during the war. The military becomes supreme for the sake of concerted action. To successfully conduct a war every industry that man is engaged in must be drawn upon to produce for the great enterprise. To talk about volunteers in such an enterprise is to talk about failure, bankruptcy, and despair. There should be no principle of volunteering recognized anywhere in time of war. It is no time to talk about individual liberty of action. War is tyranny temporarily submitted to for the sake of ultimate liberty after the struggle ends and the common enemy is subdued. To insist upon individual liberty of action in war is to lose liberty after the war by being subdued by the enemy. Every resource in men and materials should be subject to draft for the common good and to talk of depending upon volunteers when the life of the Nation is at stake is to advocate surrender to the enemy if volunteers do not respond. I would not raise a single soldier through volunteers in any arm of the service. I would raise men to serve in the Army exactly as we raise the tax money to support the Army. It is the only businesslike way to sustain the dignity and independence of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. DENT] a question?

Mr. DENT. Certainly.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have understood here this afternoon that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the great Speaker of this House, is to speak on this measure. I have some friends who are in the city who are very desirous of hearing this great citizen of the Republic speak. Can I ask the gentleman from Alabama if this is correct, and if it is correct, at about what time will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] speak?

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the Speaker of this House does intend to address the committee on this subject, and that I have reached an agreement with him that, as well as I could, I would yield to him at about 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, after two days of able debate it seems useless to attempt further enlightenment upon the question of a volunteer system versus conscription. There is no terror in the word conscription. It means compulsory registration and universal liability to serve one's country.

I would like to see the man who denies this liability. Who is he that would claim the benefits of citizenship, who asks his Government to protect his rights and otherwise serve him and yet denies his own liability to serve his country in return? [Applause.]

I hold that the State exists for the man and that the man must live for the State, else his rights, his liberty can not live.

Mr. Chairman, so much of this ground has been covered that in my short time I can only go over it and pick up scattering ideas; but there is one phase of this question that I think still has not been fully touched upon, and slightly referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO]. It seems that we can not play international politics in this country. There are too many men of many minds to permit the leaders, that we must rely upon to carry this war to a successful conclusion, to make their diplomatic moves in international politics count for the good of the country. That is the unfortunate situation at this moment.

What is Germany doing to-day in international politics? She is holding her men in leash on the Russian line, and has been doing so for a month and a half, hoping that Russia, in her unsettled condition, might make overtures for peace. That is international politics. The French and the English at Saloniki have three-quarters of a million men on that front, and yet there has been little fighting there for months. They have been waiting there, hoping that Bulgaria might see the light and sue for a separate peace. That is international politics.

Germany at this moment is playing international politics with us. Why, it has been nearly three weeks since this body

met and decided to declare the existence of a war with Germany, and yet not a ship has been sunk or a man killed in all that time. It means that Germany knows by its bitter experience with Great Britain the results of aggressive action. That experience was that before she attacked England volunteering was slight, and there was doubt whether England could raise enough troops by the volunteer system; but by the bombardment of the English coast and English cities by Zeppelins and warships Germany sent hundreds of thousands of men to the recruiting offices. Germany had that experience with England, and now she is playing politics with us by not bombarding our coasts. Heaven knows we have enough unprotected places, and Germany has submarines with big guns. If late reports be true, she has not been sinking our ships. She has refrained because she has thought that opposition to the President's policy might yet prevail here, and she would wait awhile before she opened hostilities. She hopes that this opposition may create internal disunion and render us helpless.

If the President of the United States, having mapped out a plan for the benefit of the country, having decided upon a policy that might be of the utmost importance to this country, decides that he will do this or will do that, why, dissenters in the House and dissenters in the Senate rise and obtrude their opinions upon his plans, and they have been broken.

That has been the situation thus far in this war, and I have been wondering how far it will go. As far as I am concerned, I feel very much as some other gentlemen do, that I do not want entirely to abrogate my functions as a legislator. But a good deal of that is merely a matter of pride, more perhaps of pride than patriotism, if I should insist that my plan must supplant that made by our leader, by the man upon whom we must rely to carry on this war to success. And so, fearing that I might be an obstruction to his policy, to the best policy of the country, I am going to stand by the President of the United States.

We have sworn to support the Constitution, and it says the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Whom shall we follow if not him? Shall we be safer to trust leadership to the dissenters? I would rather trust the President, with his superior information; I would rather trust the 55 soldiers of the General Staff than the lawyers and other laymen of this dissenting committee.

While I might if I chose add something to the many fearful statements that have been made here in favor of the volunteer system, yet I feel pretty much as some of these other gentlemen do that it is the nicest thing in the world to tell a man to be patriotic, but they have not thereby helped the matter any. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] pointed that out.

The committee brought in here a bill that provides neither for a voluntary system nor a conscription system, but for a system which is a mongrel, a weak compromise between the two; and while they are talking about saving the feelings of the people, about the pride of the patriotic men and boys of this country, they have done nothing to save their pride. If the draft system says, "Young man, you must come," their system says, "If you do not come, we will come after you and make you come." Their system is as much a threat as a straight draft system. And what kind of patriotism are we appealing to? Should any man feel hurt when his country calls? Is it not plain that it is democratic if we are all in the same class, where every man, as emergency may ensue, may be called upon to go out and fight for his country? If every man must do that, it is thoroughly democratic. I can not see how anybody can oppose that proposition. It is thoroughly democratic and based upon the ideals of equality. The people of this country will not be insulted if everybody is put in the same class; and when they say here that because we select the men from 21 to 40 years old, or the men from 19 to 40, or the men from 19 to 25, we have not made it democratic, they are not accurate. We desire to raise an efficient army. We must raise an army, but the greatest desideratum is that it must be efficient.

Who can deny that young men between the ages of 21 and 25 are more efficient to fight on the front and take up the battle of this country than men over that age? In all the physical strain that a man is subject to in any avocation he is a better man at 25 or 26 than he ever becomes afterwards. We all know that. We know that the average age of the soldiers of our Northern Army during the Civil War was under 19 years.

I do not believe that there is anything sinister, as has been intimated, back of this administration bill. It has been intimated that the Army officers of this country have arranged to better themselves, and that their object in proposing this conscription bill is that they shall be advanced toward high salaries and more prominent positions. I do not believe that, gentlemen. I do not think that the Members of this House ought to believe it. To say that the men we have taken from the farms and put

into the Military Academy, the men that we have taken from the shops, the men that Members of this House have themselves selected to serve their country and learn how to serve it best are unpatriotic is unfair. The inference is an insult to men who may die leading our soldiers to victory. Such men of every nation now at war have died for their flag and their country, and we have in our land men as brave and as true as any.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, my colleague.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman believe there is any disposition on the part of anyone advocating the selective draft to keep ex-President Roosevelt from raising 100,000 men to go to France voluntarily?

Mr. BATHRICK. I have no knowledge on that matter.

Mr. SWITZER. I have heard it rumored around—

Mr. BATHRICK. Some Republican in the Senate has introduced a resolution, and I understand a Republican has introduced a resolution in this House, asking that the President send him. I am afraid it is a political matter.

Mr. EMERSON. Is it not just as much politics to reject him?

Mr. SWITZER. I do not believe the gentleman knows what I intend to ask, but I would like to have his opinion.

Mr. BATHRICK. I understand now. The gentleman is patriotic. He intends nothing political. So far as I am concerned, if Theodore Roosevelt were to raise one, five, or a dozen divisions of American boys who desire to volunteer to carry the Stars and Stripes to the trenches of France, I say let him go. [Applause.] That is my opinion of it, if you want it.

Mr. MASON. Does your bill provide that?

Mr. BATHRICK. It is not my bill that I am talking about. I am supporting the minority of the committee, which is the President's viewpoint.

Mr. MASON. You are talking about a bill. Does the bill you are supporting provide that?

Mr. BATHRICK. I do not think anyone knows whether it does or not. I think it is a question of technique which I can not answer offhand. Nevertheless, it should not be a political question, and you will all agree to that. I will say this as to my side and the politics about it. We Democrats went out on the stump last fall and besought the people of this country to stand by President Wilson, and they stood by him in the election. Now the people of this country want us to stand by President Wilson. [Applause.] There is no question about that, and I am one Democrat who will do it. There is no vital question of permanent policy involved in this contention; it is a question of following our leaders and winning this war. I will follow on, and there are thousands of the great people of my district who will follow him, too. Their brand of patriotism does not quibble upon how they are called by their country, but they are saying: "We are ready. Tell us when and where."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, the elaborate discussion this bill has already received from members of the committee which had it in charge and from the press makes further debate unnecessary, but I wish to state unmistakably my position.

Every nation has the fundamental right to command the services of all its fighting men in case of war. We are now at war with the greatest military power in the world, and although its armies are now so engaged by the other nations which are also at war with it that we seem to be in no immediate danger, yet both self-respect and self-protection for the future require us to prepare for the contest.

Our present military strength is insignificant compared with our adversary. To make ourselves formidable and even safe we must immediately train and equip an army. The question at issue is, Shall we form that army by accepting everyone who volunteers, or shall we select those who are most eligible for the service and whose withdrawal from their ordinary occupations would least cripple our industrial life?

The latter course seems to me the fairest and the wisest. If we assume that everyone is equally willing to give his services to the country, then it is wise to select those who will make the best soldiers and who can best be spared. If everyone is not equally willing, then it is not fair to allow the whole burden to fall on the patriotic and let the slackers escape. Nor do we want all the enthusiasts to go into the camps, thus leaving an abnormal average of indifference at home. The experience of England, which for nearly three years has been working out this same problem under the pressure of dire emergency, ought to teach us much. The overwhelming opinion there is that it is better that the Government should make the choice and not

leave it to the individual. Success in war to-day depends so much on equipment and resources that it is necessary to organize and guard the whole industrial life of the Nation as never before. To determine when a man's service will be most useful for his country is not a problem he can solve so well as the Government. We are fighting the battle of democracy for the whole world, and it is the democratic way to make every man liable to serve the country and then let the country determine where that service can best be rendered. The rich and the poor, the active and the indolent, the willing and the unwilling, all should be treated with exact equality, with only one invariable rule, What is best for the Nation? The sacrifice can not be made equal for all, but the good of the country must govern.

It is not enthusiasm alone which can win such a war as this; it can be won only by a careful organization and development and coordination of all the industries and all the men of the country.

We have recently had an illustration in my own community of the unfairness of the voluntary system. Last summer our National Guard regiment was sent to the Mexican border. In it were many men with families dependent on them who suffered severely from their absence. There were plenty of men without families or dependents who would have made equally good soldiers. When they returned from Mexico they were allowed slowly to take up once more their business life and once more provide for the support and comfort of their families. But when this war broke out there was immediate necessity for guarding exposed localities. Was the inconvenience and business disturbance shifted and divided over the whole community? No; these same soldiers who had been sent to Mexico because they had volunteered and because the Nation had left the selection to the individuals themselves instead of making the selection for them—these same men again were called out because they were the only ones who had been adequately trained, and they and their families again had to bear all the inconvenience. The fair, the democratic, way is to assume that the country is entitled to the service of every man and that every man is willing, and then let him be selected whose age and relationship and occupation points to the Army as the field where he can be most useful. Such a system would save innumerable heartaches. In thousands of homes throughout the land the father and the mother will be wrestling anxiously and prayerfully with the question whether it is the duty of their boy to enlist, but their minds will be besieged by conflicting arguments, and the strain of the decision and then the uncertainty whether it was wise will bring anguish and bitterness into countless lives. Let the Government take that responsibility from them and decide where each man can best render service, and it will lighten the anxiety of our homes as well as secure the best contribution to every phase of our material activity. To enlist is not a privilege which should be granted to those who crave it; it is not a burden to be imposed upon those only who are patriotic enough to assume it; but it is a duty which should be apportioned by the Government upon those citizens whose condition makes it for the advantage of the whole community that they should do this work. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the men in this House who do not believe in compulsory military service, even at this hour of our Nation's peril. I did not formerly believe in it myself. In fact, I was one of those who had to be persuaded, but I have been watching the course of the enlistment plans of the War and Navy Departments with close attention, and I am sorry to say that, in my judgment, they have not been and will not be the success that we all had hoped for.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, I have just spent a few days in my home city—and I think no man will challenge the statement that Boston is as patriotic as any other city in all this land. I found a fine, healthy, whole-hearted approval of the action of Congress in declaring a state of war existing between this country and Germany, and I found that there were many young fellows applying for the right to enlist in the service of their country, with a fair percentage of them being accepted. I learned that some of our State militia regiments have been ordered to the colors, and that, as usual, the famous Fighting Ninth was being given the major portion of whatever responsibility now devolves upon our State troops which are guarding public works and highways. I also found that the enlistments were coming chiefly from one element of the population in my city; and while I am sorry in some degree to be compelled to say this, yet with some pride I want to announce to the House that in Boston it appears to be the Kellys, the Burkes, and the Sheas who are now volunteering their services in defense of the flag. For one, I do not believe that the glory which comes to

those who shoulder the musket or man the decks ought to be bestowed alone upon the descendants of the fighting race, and so that there may be glory enough for all I have made up my mind that I am going to vote for universal service, in order that all might have a share.

Now, it is a well-recognized fact that a call for volunteers brings instant response from pretty nearly all that is best in the manhood of the Nation. It finds its coldest response from those who are least fitted to survive and whose survival is of least value to the Nation. While I dislike the use of the word "conscription," I must say that conscription takes in everyone. We all must have recognized before this hour that a volunteer army divides our Nation into two groups, one a group of patriots and the other a group of slackers. There is a good deal in the newspapers these days about "slackers." It is not a pleasant word, and it has not a pleasant meaning. My idea of a "slacker" is one who dodges war service—one who, able to serve his country, refuses. During the first year of the war England reechoed with the word. The epithet was bestowed without discrimination upon every young man not in uniform, and then England adopted compulsory universal service, and slackers and rumors of slackers were no more. Thousands of brave young fellows were brought back from the trenches to serve in industry, where they rightly belonged. No man who was needed at home was sent into camp, and no man who was needed in camp was left at home. The new system was just and it was efficient. There are no slackers in England now, but our own America is having its turn. Why, I have noticed that the War Department has been obliged to issue notice that marriages contracted since the declaration of war will not be considered as excusing men from liability to military service; it has been discovered that many men of military age have suddenly married, and the Government rightly intends to put a stop to that sort of romance. It believes that the slackers—the horror of the Government and the bane of the Nation—must be balked, and if Congress at this time will stand firmly behind the President there will be no slackers. There will be a selective draft; those needed at home will stay at home; those not needed will go into the Army. All will automatically become patriots, and the Nation can settle down to its task with the knowledge that all is well; the whole citizenry will have contributed to the Army and patriotism will have done its utmost. [Applause.]

Oh, yes; America has been prompt in offering its money. Shall it be less prompt in offering its men? Mr. Chairman, we want a citizen army drawn from the whole citizenry, drawn in orderly fashion, with selection of those best fitted to serve. Once more let me repeat that we do not desire to put a gun on the shoulder of any man who is needed at home; and, if you please, we do not want to support in home luxury any man who can well be spared at the front. Our country is preparing to take its part—and perhaps the greatest part—in the greatest of all wars. I ask you, Shall we make a fife-and-drum holiday of this grim occasion or shall we make it a great national effort, calling upon all alike for loyalty and service? Shall we follow the unfortunate example of the English and sacrifice our best and bravest in the early period of learning? There is no tragedy in all that grim story, splendid as are many of its pages, greater than the tragedy of the untold thousands of the best, the bravest, and the most promising of the English young men who were sacrificed to national inexperience in all the battles that lie between Ypres and the early stages of the Somme. [Applause.]

I do not desire at this time to go over the story of all the wars that this country has been engaged in to show the failure of the volunteer system, but I might remind you that when the Civil War broke out we pursued the same old policy of bounties and short-term enlistments which had obtained in our previous military struggles. You all remember the story of the first battle of Bull Run, when the raw and untrained troops of the North, who had enlisted for three months, were routed by the Confederate Army, and although this first defeat should have taught the North a lesson, we repeated it throughout the war and even aggravated the errors of the past. When regiments had been decimated at the front, instead of filling up these regiments, which had by that time trained officers, new regiments were organized under officers of little or no experience and were sent to the front to take the place of those men who had been hardened by campaigning. When the war was over the sacrifice of life due to ineffective and incompetent handling of the troops staggered the world.

I need not recall to you the lessons of the Spanish-American War or the methods pursued, and the results of those methods are undoubtedly familiar to all of you. We had no adequate standing army, no field artillery of any consequence, and an insufficiency of supplies. And, worst of all, there was a gen-

eral lack of organization which would have spelled disaster had we been opposed by any forces of the first-class European nations. Let us not fool ourselves about the situation which now confronts our common country. We have been deluded by the peace advocates, and unfortunately their propaganda has taken a much stronger hold of the country than some of us believe. Until now we have been lulled into the belief that our present position on this hemisphere was the most natural defense and that the possibility of invasion or attack by a foreign foe was the dream of the military enthusiast and the professional soldier; and yet in my time in this House I have heard it repeatedly stated on the floor here, without adequate refutation or denial, that Japan, which is over 20 days' sail from our western shores, could land an army of 200,000 men upon our shores before we could transport any adequate forces to oppose their landing. Yes; and within the month I have heard one of the greatest military authorities in this country publicly announce that in a conflict with Germany, if the British fleet were caught napping, it would be the merriest kind of a military frolic for the German Navy to take the great city of New York.

Mr. Chairman, with such a situation confronting us, it ought to be apparent to all that our country is pressed by the necessity for immediate and drastic action. It will be a costly experience to prepare. Hundreds of thousands of men must be taken from the walks of life and must spend some time in learning the pursuits and practices of military life which are necessary for our proper participation in this war. I believe that the people of my State are substantially unanimous in the demand for this military preparation. I realize that perhaps the same enthusiasm does not present itself to the citizens of the Middle Western States, for many of them know what a warship looks like only from pictures. And at this point I venture to say that there is many a man in the Congress of the United States who up to this very moment has never yet beheld one of the fighting ships of our country's Navy.

When you talk about our citizen soldiery, may I be permitted to say that we in Massachusetts have done much, if not more, than any other of the States in the Union? We have five Infantry regiments, one of which, the gallant Ninth, is recorded at the War Department as having established for itself the finest record of any of the State troops which gathered along the Texas border a few months ago. Its history is one of a record of glorious achievement, and it has brought credit and distinction in all its service to the great Commonwealth which it has represented. We have a regiment of Coast Artillery which is better than that of any other military organization of its kind in the United States. With four fine troops of Cavalry, two batteries of Field Artillery long established and a third in process of organization, a signal corps, two ambulance companies, a field hospital company, and a corps of cadets, Massachusetts' contribution to the military preparedness of the United States now rises to the splendid figure of 8,000 men; but the people of my State believe that these young men ought not be the only ones called upon to help fight the battles of the country, and they stand almost united for universal liability to service.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that there are more volunteers in the Central Middle West than in any other part of the country? [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. I did not know that that was a fact, but I am glad to be enlightened.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have had more volunteers from Chicago than from New York and Philadelphia put together.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I wish those volunteers would impress the Members of Congress to vote for this legislation. If they did, they would show more patriotism than their Representatives do. [Applause.]

Let us not continue to ignore the lessons taught us by our previous wars and place our ultimate reliance upon a few citizen soldiers, who, willing and ready, can not do it all. I can not believe that it will be necessary for us to taste the bitterness of national defeat before the Representatives in the Congress of the United States awake to the stern realization of the absolute necessity of putting into the law of the land the program of our great President. By this means, and this means only, in my judgment, will the Stars and Stripes continue to wave triumphant over a free democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, after I voted "no" on the war resolution I received many letters and telegrams regarding that vote, one of them read:

We have burned you in effigy and across your breast we placed an inscription reading, "The twentieth century Benedict Arnold."

Another was a copy of one sent to President Wilson, in which I was severely condemned for my vote against the not necessarily infallible advice of the President. The most of these communications I ignored, but at last the worm turned, and in one case I wired:

I presume the people of Blanktown are enlisting freely for the trenches of Europe, not awaiting conscription—the first resort of the tyrant having the power of life and death over his subjects, the last resort of a noble people believing in freedom of thought, speech, and action.

Mr. Chairman, that message, sent in a spirit of irony, expressed a feeling and sentiment in my heart and soul that I still find there after having listened for all of two days to the specious arguments and elegant pleas of those here who stand for the General Staff and administration plan for selective conscription.

Mr. Chairman, for many months Members of the House of Representatives have been flooded with letters and telegrams, with newspaper clippings and newspapers with marked columns, all advocating and pleading for a system of universal military training. I had them until 48 hours ago in that form and language. Since then I got them from various county and State political and municipal body officials, giving out the idea that the people of their vicinities were "fierce" for universal military service and selective conscription combined, one term the exact antipode of the other. Universal and selective—one, everybody; the other, those I choose. The psychological moment had come to tear the veneering from the real purpose of the campaign for universal military training and show selective conscription, virtually the right to prescribe death for some of our boys and life for others.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN], the former Socialist mayor of his town, now an elegant exponent of the democracy of selection, near the conclusion of his fiery peroration used the words "universal military service under this selective conscription bill." There is not one iota or scintilla of universal service in selective conscription. Are we always to gull the people? Are they not worthy of a square deal? If we want to conscript in accordance with the President's advice, why not say so and leave off the false and misleading but just-sounding title of "universal military training"?

Mr. Chairman, we commenced this war with the people suffering under a misapprehension of the facts. We are now trying to put this selective draft over in the same way. The President, in his masterly diction and beautiful English, first took the "military" out of service and showed by suggestion how patriotic men could be raising "spuds" for the Army or engaging in manufacturing epaulettes for officers' garments and buttons for service uniforms, or in any of the walks of life on which the Nation's welfare depends, and he, in his infinite wisdom, is to be the sole judge of the need of such service. Both bills introduced into Congress make exempt certain classes of activities, and to that extent have already selected. They could have drafted an ordinary conscription bill giving all men between certain ages exactly the same opportunity for service. Oh, no; that would not be democratic! So they leave in the word "selective" and give to some administrative officer the right to say whose son shall fight in the trenches and whose shall raise Missouri mules for Army needs. "Consistency, thou art a jewel!"

Under selective conscription Mr. Johnson's son goes in the Army, has a leg or both arms shot off; his eyes are burned out; he may come home a poor wreck of humanity to drag out at best a miserable existence. The son of Mr. Morgan, if he has one, can be of more use to his country helping his noble father finance the nations of the earth. He lives out his life in opulence and plenty, loved and respected, sound of limb and full of life, and what time he does not put in making more money he may nobly devote to thinking out some method whereby his millions may be invested so as to avoid paying taxes to help pay Mr. Johnson's son and other war derelicts pensions on which to eke out the remainder of their miserable lives. I was moved almost to tears when I read in Sunday's paper John D. Rockefeller, jr.'s, quoted remarks on the beneficent leveling effect of universal military training as applied through selective conscription. Noble sentiments, but the administrative officer under the hallowed term of "universal service," with the "military" extracted, could easily see that John D.'s 19-year-old son, if he has one, is almost indispensable to his country figuring out just how much gasoline they could furnish the Government for war purposes and the populace for peace purposes without reducing the price too much to make it possible for them to buy a few more untaxed bonds to show their patriotism.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proscribed man, a traitor to my country, because under my oath of office and my right to

freedom of speech and action guaranteed me by the Constitution of my country I had the effrontery to vote against the advice of him "who kept us out of war" against our going into war. To that extent I was guilty of lèse majesté. Oh, my countrymen and gentlemen, as I am already a goat, I'll go a little further and express my traitorous feelings somewhat in regard to the use of the word "slacker" as applied to our people. The President is reported as having given as one of his reasons for advocating the selective conscription of boys between 19 and 25 his desire to "catch the slackers." Oh, my God! Now, we go ahead and conscript an army and as they pass along—going, many of them, to a certain death—the public mind questions "How many of those are slackers?" Nineteen to twenty-five, just begun to live, and called slackers by those who have lived and sinned from twice to thrice their span of life. [Applause.] "Slackers," to use that opprobrious epithet in regard to boys 19 to 25, even though they do shrink from death, life looking joyful and bright to them, is an outrage. They were not shipping any arms and other contraband of war to Europe; some of them may even question whether it is right to ask them to die to guarantee what has been designated as a "doubtful legal right." I think to use a term like that in regard to boys and men of that age is altogether contemptible and totally inexcusable, especially in advance of any call for their services. I suppose along with the Stars and Stripes, in simple justice these conscripts you are going to shanghai, will be allowed to carry a simple banner stating, "Really and truly, our countrymen, we are not slackers."

Mr. Chairman, had this administration conscription bill been framed to catch the slackers between the ages of 25 to 60, I think there might be some need for it. [Applause.] Many men whose lives have not been what they should have been, desecrators of homes, betrayers of innocence, those who have ground down the poor and by other iniquitous practices have made themselves unfit to live, yet are afraid to die, might well be named slackers, but not our youth to be led like lambs to the slaughter.

The administration, which is credited with giving out this plan of selective conscription, has been quoted by the press as saying, "Young men who have married since this plan of service was given out to the public and in advance of the passage of the law—which the administration at least thought was sure to be passed as had been decreed—should not on account of such marriage be exempt." They are "slackers." Hundreds of such marriages have been consummated, hundreds, no doubt, arranged for in the natural processes of our people before the horrors of war were realized, and now by a war-mad press and, if quoted correctly, an offended administration, the young men who contracted them are to be forced to enlist for daring to realize their ambitions and satisfying nature's most ennobling and natural function by creating a home. They have failed to realize responsibility as exemplified in the "master's voice"; they are "slackers"; we will tear them asunder in the name of democracy for the good of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would not feel justified in alluding to these newspaper utterances in respect to this matter had the administration not been so correctly reported by them for some months. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, President Wilson has said:

We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of the Nation can make them.

The sentiment is grand, the diction perfect. How it electrified the hearts of the people who read it! "The sacrifices we shall freely make." Who are "we"? I suppose these 500,000 men who are to be conscripted now—5,000,000, maybe, later on—are a part of "we offering our services freely." Oh, no! It evidently did not mean "we the people." "We" had an entirely different meaning there. "We" must have meant "me and mine, Congress." It could have meant nothing else followed immediately by this selective-draft measure. By implication it says, "You may have been willing to have offered yourself freely, I don't know; I will not take any chances on you; obey your master's voice and come whether or no. I say you shall be one of the 'champions of mankind' in the name of democracy, and I'll make you fight for the 'faith and freedom of the Nation' as exemplified by Congress passing a selective-conscription bill as a fundamental principle of democracy." Oh, yes; we shall freely give our sons—such as I select—to down "Prussian militarism," which forces men to fight willy-nilly, thus making a great machine that is dangerous to the welfare of the world. We will "fight the devil with fire," and to scotch him we will adopt his own plan, which has been so effective, and we will "democratize" the German Empire even though

we will have to Prussianize and autocratize free America to do so. "We'll make 'em do it freely so as to secure the 'freedom of the Nation.'"

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time of the committee arguing as to the merits and demerits of the volunteer system; I will extend these deductions in the RECORD, if there is no objection. The volunteer system is the one under which all our victories have been won; our small experience with conscription did not exemplify its wisdom or efficiency. Mr. Chairman, I am not as much concerned just now as to the most efficient way—and no man values true efficiency more highly than do I—but I value more highly the fundamental principle of freedom and the perpetuity of the freedom of the masses of the people. God pity them, if to democratize Germany we are to be compelled to Prussianize America! [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED].

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, three years ago next August the European war broke out. It was known from the start as a world war, and it did not require, it seems to me, a very farsighted statesmanship to realize that it was going to be a difficult matter for this country to escape involvement. Many patriotic men did realize it, and through the newspapers and on the public platform called the attention of the people to our condition of unreadiness for war, and tried to create among the people a desire and demand for the adoption of a policy of thoroughgoing preparedness. One of the first and most zealous men in this work was our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. Certain sections of the country appreciated the force of the arguments made in this educational campaign, and other sections turned an absolutely deaf ear. In December, 1914, after the war had been in progress for four months, the President of the United States in his address on the convening of the Congress decried the attempts which were being made to induce Congress to strengthen the military and naval forces. He asserted that we were in no danger of becoming involved in the war, that our isolated situation rendered us secure, and that the sentiment for preparedness was hysterical. Such a statement coming from the President of the United States greatly strengthened the position of the pacifists and measurably weakened the position of the advocates of preparedness, with the result that nothing was done for preparedness during the year 1914, and nothing was done for preparedness during the year 1915, although in the month of May of that year the German Government committed one of the worst and most indefensible crimes in history in the sinking of the steamship *Lusitania* with the loss of more than twelve hundred innocent lives, including 113 citizens of the United States.

In December, 1915, the President again appeared before Congress and delivered a message, in which he completely reversed himself from the position on the question of preparedness which he had taken a year before; but still the message was mild and pacific. It was not until the summer of 1916 that the President seemed to fully wake up to a true appreciation of our real situation, when he made his tour of the Middle West advocating a policy of preparedness for war. During the summer of 1916 we appropriated large sums of money to be expended by the War and Navy Departments in strengthening our military position, but to-day I regret to say that in many vital respects we are not much better off than we were three years ago. The hearings on this bill reveal a state of inactivity on the part of the War Department, which is exceedingly hard for me, at least, to understand. It appears that we have not made a rifle in a Government arsenal since the passage of the appropriation for that purpose last year, and that only a few thousand old rifles have been repaired; that we have very few machine and antiaircraft guns and not a single piece of heavy mobile ordnance and have not placed an order for a single piece, although the Secretary of War admits in the record that it is absolutely indispensable if our Army is to actively take the field. Under the most favorable conditions it is stated we should hope to be able to begin to get some of this necessary matériel at the end of 6 or 7 months, and that it would be the expectation of the War Department to have enough at the end of 14 to 16 months to equip an army of 500,000 men, but the General Staff estimates that it will take 30 months to get sufficient matériel to equip an army of 1,000,000 men. If we had started the work of preparedness 30 months ago, as we should have done in the light of the events which were taking place in the world, we could easily have to-day an army of 1,000,000 men fully trained and equipped with everything necessary for their protection and efficiency, ready to take the field at a moment's notice. If we had such an army now it would not have been necessary for us to provide for the issuance of \$7,000,000,000 of bonds. If we had such an army now we would not be at war with Germany to-day and would not be

in the humiliating position of having nothing to fight with but our Navy and our money, dependent for our protection upon the armies and fleets of our allies.

The President of the United States is at last fully awake to the needs of the hour. His war message was one of the finest public utterances of a century, breathing the true spirit of Americanism in every line. I believe that the War Department is also at last awake to the needs of the hour and from now on can be relied upon to push things with vigor. It is incomprehensible to me, in view of the existing situation and the valuable time which has been lost, that any attempt should now be made by the Congress of the United States to further impede the work of preparation by foisting upon the country the volunteer system of raising an army in the face of the lessons of history, of the experience of every nation which has tried it, including our own, and against the unanimous advice of the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and, what is really more to the point, the military experts of our Government. Under the feudal system, where the baron and his retainers were supported by the tenantry, the baron was under an obligation to perform military service for his tenants' protection; but in a democracy, where the privileges of citizenship are the same to all, the obligation to serve the country in the Army is the same to all, and no volunteer system should be permitted to furnish a cover under which the shirker and the skulker can hide and evade the performance of the military obligation which he owes to his country. The volunteer system is unfair, unjust, and undemocratic, and from a military point of view it is unscientific and wasteful. The chairman of the committee, in the course of his remarks, stated, as I understood him, that it did not make much difference how an army was raised. I beg to take issue with the chairman on that point. I believe it is of vital fundamental importance how an army is raised. Under the volunteer system the high-minded, patriotic, generous youth and a large proportion of all the men of military experience offer their services. Acting upon the assumption that no other than this initial force would be raised for the war, and without consideration of the selfishness of permitting the sacrifice, it would certainly be bad economy to permit the flower of the Nation's youth to be cut down to save the weeds; and if you intend to provide for raising additional increments to this initial force—and it would certainly be the supremacy of folly not to do so under existing conditions—then it would be most unwise to permit your best officer material to be killed off in the early days of the war and thus find yourself short of the right kind of men to train and lead the succeeding increments. Under such a system the tendency would be for each succeeding increment to be poorer in quality than the one which preceded it, and it is of the highest importance that the entire Army throughout the war should continue of even quality.

Under the administration bill the age limit of men to be taken by conscription was 19 to 25, inclusive, and under the committee bill it is 21 to 40. I understand the reason why the War Department limited the age to 25 years was because men under 26 were for the most part unsettled in life and not needed to maintain the industrial processes of the Nation, and also because it would be a somewhat difficult matter and take considerable time to eliminate from a wider conscription the men who were needed in industrial life, but I do not believe either reason valid. We all know there are hundreds of thousands of men over 25 years of age who are not engaged in an industry and just as available for military service as the men under 25 years of age. Under the administration plan the first increment of 500,000 was to be taken from men 19 to 25 years of age, inclusive, and then the second, the third, the fourth increment, and so on, until the entire number of available men of the country between these ages had been exhausted. It is to me an unthinkable proposition that the young men between these ages should be asked to make the sole blood sacrifice when all military experts agree that men in good physical condition up to at least 40 years of age are available for service. I think the committee was in error in fixing the minimum age at 21, and fail to see the force of the argument that no man should be sent to the front who is not old enough to vote. If a man is mature and fit for service from a physical standpoint, it seems to me it does not make much difference whether he is 20 or 21; but, on the other hand, if we fix the age at 21, we are depriving the country of the services of about half a million men annually, who are at least as old as the men who bore the burden of the Civil War in the Union and Confederate Armies.

I realize it is highly desirable that this measure shall be so framed as not to make conscription appear a penalty for the failure to volunteer, and for that reason the provisions of the British conscription acts appeal to me. I think we should pass a bill conscripting all of the men of the country between 19 and 40 years of age, inclusive, who would

then pass automatically into the reserve, permitting from this body volunteer enlistments until the Regular Army and National Guard units were at war strength, and then taking from the balance the additional increments required. The men in exempt classes or who were needed in industrial life would be excused from service and assigned to work in the industries necessary to the maintenance of the Army on proper proof. The administration bill, as I am informed, was prepared by the Judge Advocate General, under instructions from the Secretary of War, from notes prepared by the Secretary of War after consultation with members of the General Staff and other military experts. I believe the administration bill does not bear the full indorsement of the General Staff, and that in the bill the General Staff recommended there was provision for the establishment of a system of universal military training. The President, I believe, was opposed to that provision on the ground that when we are engaged in war is not the proper time to establish a permanent military policy applicable to peace conditions; that the present war will undoubtedly create many changes, and that we should not adopt a permanent military policy until we know what those changes are, so that we can shape our policy with reference to them. With all due respect for the President's judgment, I take the liberty to believe that he is just exactly as wrong on this proposition as he was in 1914 when he opposed the preparedness program. It seems to me that universal military training is so universal and so applicable to all conditions that I can not conceive of any circumstances which might arise in our national life that would not make its establishment a splendid thing for the country if only for the moral and physical betterment of our young men, and from a military point of view it certainly is and always will be the fundamental basis of national preparedness. The history of the world from the earliest times conclusively proves that any nation which neglects the military arts becomes soft, passes into a state of decay, breaks up, or comes under the dominion of a stronger and more virile State. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, if a man favors voluntary service he ought to have the courage to say that he is for that kind of service and for no other; if he is against selective draft or conscription, he ought to have the courage to say that he is opposed to that kind of system and refuse to sanction it in any way.

We all respect a fighter and we all condemn a slacker—whether by that we mean a man who will not fight for his country or a member of a committee who shirks his responsibilities. If anyone wants to know what a "slacker" means, all he has to do is to examine the bill reported out by the majority of the Military Committee.

They did not have the courage to advocate an out-and-out voluntary system, and they did not have the courage to refuse to mention selective draft or conscription. So, like the slacker, they tried a compromise.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] stated the other day, the four members of the Military Committee who saw service in 1898—the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAGO; the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. GREENE; and the gentleman from New York, Mr. LUNN—have signed the minority report favoring selective draft.

Upon looking over the names advocating the volunteer-service bill, I find some gentlemen of about the same age as those of the committee who saw service in 1898. I take it for granted that they did not believe in volunteer service at that time; at least they did not believe in it strongly enough to volunteer their services to their country. Apparently the only way their country could have secured their services at that time was to conscript them. As the volunteer system did not result in their volunteering their services at that time, so the volunteer system will not help us to get the boys of to-day who hold the same ideas now as some of the gentlemen held in 1898. To get the boys of like ideas in the Army to-day we will have to conscript them, and it might just as well be done now as later.

All of these distinguished gentlemen voted to declare war, all of these distinguished gentlemen voted for the \$7,000,000,000 bill to carry on the war, and now they refuse to raise the soldiers to do the fighting.

Perhaps that is not exactly correct—they do not refuse to do it—they do not do it. It would look to an innocent bystander as if they thought it would not be good politics at this time to come out for selective draft, so they "pass the buck" to the President—not a very statesmanlike thing to do. They seem to desire to place themselves in a secure position, no matter what happens. If the President resorts to the selective draft system and it is not popular, they blame the President,

and if it makes out all right, then they can say, "We did it; we gave him the authority."

The people back home are not much concerned these days about what is or what is not good politics. They only know that we are at war—even if some Members of Congress do not—and that they want it to come to a successful conclusion as soon as possible. The man who hesitates these days between duty to his country and good politics is absolutely lost forever, and he might as well order a reserve seat for a ride up "Salt River" now.

I am no new convert to universal training, universal service, or selective draft. I became a convert to all three when we went to Cuba in 1898.

Very few of the boys knew how to take care of themselves, and in most cases the officers did not know how to even take care of themselves, to say nothing about taking care of the boys intrusted to their care. I have seen men die like dogs because they had not the slightest idea of what ought to be done to protect their lives and they could get no help from their officers.

My own company was particularly fortunate in having a man as captain who did know what ought to be done, and, more than that, he made us do it. Most of us owe our lives to his ability.

It rained in Cuba every day and many of the officers did not know enough to insist upon tents being raised from the ground several feet; many of them did not even have their men build outhouses. If some of the gentlemen who advocate the volunteer system so strongly had seen as much of it as the ones who saw a little service, they would not be so anxious to continue the system.

As a comrade wrote me the other day, "Many a volunteer company would elect a bartender as captain one day and shoot him the next."

Capt. Millar has always advocated universal training and service, and is in favor of the bill for the "selective draft."

In a letter to me the other day he writes me in part as follows:

UNIVERSAL SERVICE.

HUBBELL, MICH., April 12, 1917.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMRADE: I am thoroughly convinced in my own mind that universal service is the only method by which we, the American people, can be prepared at all times to meet such a crisis as we have at the present time. Furthermore, I feel it is the duty of every young man to devote some of his time in the service of his country.

The benefits to be derived by the young men are almost too numerous to mention. He would profit by being associated with young men from all parts of the United States, which would broaden his ideas of his fellow man. It would be a great benefit in building him up physically and mentally, but I think the greatest benefit would be discipline. This is something most of our young men seem to know little about. Without discipline you can not have efficiency. I believe this to be the aim of universal service—to have efficient men at all times to carry the burdens of the country.

Very truly, yours,

GEORGE MILLAR.

Among those who saw service with us in Cuba in 1898 was Mr. Homer A. Guck, of Houghton, Mich., editor of the Mining Gazette, who saw service as private in Company D, Thirty-fourth Michigan. Here is an editorial that he writes, entitled "Conscription," which expresses the views of practically every man who saw service in 1898:

CONSCRIPTION.

The vital thing in the Army bill which Secretary Baker has submitted to Congress is its rejection of the volunteer system. Selective compulsory service must be resorted to if we are to have a representative, efficient, democratic Army. Every pacifist, every slacker, every enemy of military preparedness knows this. For that reason all the elements in Congress and out of it which want to retard military development and thereby keep our participation in the war down to a minimum are now making a drive against conscription. They want to retain the volunteer system, which has broken down every time the United States has relied upon it, and can be depended upon to break down again.

Representative ANTHONY, of Kansas, a Republican, but one of the chief supporters in the last Congress of the futile and fraudulent Hay bill, has given notice that he will try to amend the administration's measure in committee by substituting voluntary enlistment for the General Staff's selective compulsory service plan. The main fight in the committee and in the House will thus come on this proposition to denature the new Army bill—to stringhalt it after the treacherous Hay fashion.

The administration's draft makes some slight concessions to those who still cling to the ancient delusion that some subtle tribute is paid to individual and moral liberty in the haphazard, inequitable, let-somebody-else-do-it theory of military service. The staff plan provides that the Regular Establishment may be recruited to war strength by voluntary enlistment. But if volunteers do not come fast enough conscription will be resorted to. The ranks of the National Guard may also be filled by volunteering, so long as that method produces results worth while. But the President is to have, as he now has, the power to draft men for National Guard service. Conscription will be applied exclusively in raising the new armies, 500,000 men at a time.

In our opinion, the sooner the country gets on an exclusive conscription basis the better. Volunteering may be of some service for a few weeks, while the machinery of conscription is being set up. It may help a little to make up deficiencies in the Regular Army and in the National Guard regiments. Conscription is already authorized in the case of the guard. So the Regular Establishment is the only field in which volunteering can be of real value to the Government. We doubt whether it will be of real value there, for the class of volunteers to

which the Regular service appeals is now, as it has always been, exceedingly limited.

Many Congressmen are finding fault with the conscription theory. Some think it will be unpopular. Southern Democrats do not like its universality. They object to a draft which would apply equally to all citizens, white and black. But these objections to a method which the Government is obliged to apply if it wants to make war successfully should have been urged before war was declared. They have no pertinency now. All other considerations must yield now to the demands of a sound military policy. Pacifists, slackers, objectors to military service, and other obstructionists must recognize that their individual prejudices are no longer of consequence when weighed against the safety of the State and the efficiency of its armies.

Conscription must come, because there is no way to avoid conscription and still raise the sort of armies which we must raise. The administration has at last gotten right on the question of military preparation. It is accepting the views of the General Staff. Members of Congress who voted for the Hay law last year ought to be diffident about challenging the General Staff's authority. They did their worst in the way of picayunish amateurism. They ought to be very humble and silent now.

He also states:

We are pleased that JULIUS KAHN, a Republican, is the leader for the President to put through the most sensible, practicable bill that can be put into effect to bring about a real army in a real way. KAHN is one of the men of brains in the House.

Many of the boys throughout the country in 1898 who were patriotic enough to enlist found, much to their disappointment, upon their return that the coward, the "slacker," the boy with the "yellow streak," was holding down their jobs. If the bill as proposed by the committee goes through there will be thousands more of "slackers" holding down jobs that belong to better men.

The committee is afraid to come out now for an out-and-out "volunteer service" bill and against the "draft," but I understand that everyone of them voted to "draft" the members of the National Guard, whether or not they were willing. What they thought was all right to do to the National Guard they dare not do to the rest of their constituents.

Another thing, all politics ought to be eliminated from the Army that we are now raising for "fighting" purposes, not for "dress parade." A man ought to secure his job because he is qualified, not because he is a "good mixer" or is popular "with the boys." You generally find that the men themselves will regret their choice of a good mixer when they are put up against real service. And yet this bill evidently intends that that kind of thing shall continue. If these gentlemen ever had any experience with some of these volunteer officers they would not be so desirous of having this section in the bill. They would want to have the best man they could get on the job. I know a thing or two about incompetent officers who got their jobs on account of politics, "good mixers," and "one of the boys."

I have seen men having to wear the blue uniform instead of khaki when it was 90° in the shade and "no shade." There were thousands of khaki suits at Siboney; but the man who ought to secure them did not know how to do it. Many times there was sufficient grub to be had if the man who ought to know did know how to get it—seeing he did not, we lived on short rations many a time. There were ambulances that could be had if the man who ought to know did know how to get them—instead of that, sick as a man might be, he walked or rode in anything that could be had.

The little trouble we had in 1898 is only a mere skirmish to what is going on in Europe now, and for that reason we need the best men we can get in every position, and we should so frame every bill that ability counts instead of politics or good-fellowship.

Many of the letters that I have had in favor of universal service have been from people who at one time were "pacifists," or who believed we needed practically no army. The war in Europe has made them change their minds. Among those who are now convinced of the necessity of universal service is Judge P. H. O'Brien, our circuit judge, and one of the most influential Democrats in Michigan, and his letter, which I give in part, explains itself:

Hon. W. FRANK JAMES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Houghton, Mich., April 7, 1917.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I meant to write you some time ago, but as my speech on "The Flag" contained a statement of my sentiments on the question of universal military training, I thought perhaps you would have secured a clipping thereof. I am sending you under separate cover a copy of the speech as it appeared in the Hancock Evening Journal.

Permit me to state that until recently I have been opposed to militarism in every form. The events of the last 30 months, however, have caused me to investigate the whole subject of national defense de novo. I am convinced not only from the development of the present great war, but also from a study of history, that any nation occupying any desirable and extensive portion of the earth's surface must be prepared to defend it. The choice, therefore, is between a large standing army and the adoption of a scheme of compulsory universal military training.

A standing army may very readily be used for the purpose of overthrowing the government and establishing tyranny. On the other

hand, a citizenry trained to arms will always uphold democratic institutions.

Universal training itself will have a tendency to bring together in fraternal fellowship young men from every class of our population. This will serve to unify our democracy. Besides, I favor this method of training, because it places the burden of defense equally on all of our citizens instead of relying upon the voluntary efforts of the most unselfish.

I hope, therefore, that Congress will pass a bill adopting a permanent and comprehensive scheme of compulsory universal military training.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Yours, sincerely,

P. H. O'BRIEN.

I have had some letters from people opposed to the idea of each man doing his "bit" in this national crisis, but I am glad to state that none of these un-American and unpatriotic letters came from the twelfth district of Michigan.

I received one the other day from one Rochelle—do not know what his nationality is, but, judging from the contents, should imagine he had some Chinese blood in his veins, as he was an avowed peace-at-any-price man. He wanted this bill so worded that he and his sons would not have to defend their country no matter what happened. These "yellow" boys who object to do any fighting themselves would be the first to cry for help if an enemy came in sight.

In the same mail I had two letters from fathers in my district. One, Alfred Gregor, a miner, had two sons in the service of their country. Like a good father, he did not regret their having volunteered. He says, in part:

I do not think we ought to stick to the volunteer system. All families should provide their share of the men for the Army and the Navy.

Another good patriotic citizen said, in part:

While I am too old for military service, being 65, I have four boys who are able and willing to serve their country, but I would want to see them go into the service with a fair chance, and not in an unprepared manner, and not under officers who do not know how to take care of their men, especially in camp. I hope Congress will pass the universal service law and distribute the duties of military service where they belong, upon all the citizens, and not upon a few who are patriotic enough to assume the burden.

To those Members who are afraid that if they vote for this bill they will "get in bad" with the members of the National Guard back home let me read the following from Col. Willard C. Fisk, Seventh Regiment, New York:

For all the officers and men of my command (the Seventh Regiment) and for the greater part of its 8,000 or 9,000 former members I want to say that we are unanimously, unalterably, in favor of universal training and service, and that as a fundamental democratic principle of government it should be exclusively under Federal control. I don't see how any thinking man with even small military experience can have any other opinion.

I have no criticism for the National Guard, but I recognize that, as constituted under the unfortunate and mistaken Hay bill, it is a weak reed for the country to rely on for its first-line force. For this country to contemplate entering a world conflict with no settled military policy, no reserve, a small army, a guard divided into 48 States, with no obligation on the youth and brawn of the country to serve, is certainly suicidal.

I love the guard. I love my own organization. I have heard it said that universal service means obliteration of the guard. I do not believe that is necessary, but if it is necessary why should it stand in the way of a broad, comprehensive policy for this country?

If it is any satisfaction to those who oppose universal service or the selective draft, I wish to state that they are not the only ones who hope that no bill of that kind will pass. They have good company in part of the Berlin press. The Die Post said editorially the other day:

So long as universal military service is not established in America by law, no German can be forced to take up arms against the fatherland.

The gentlemen who are against universal service and selective draft will have to decide in a day or so and show by their votes whether the Die Post will be pleased or whether the best interests of this country will be served.

A treasonable organization called the Antienlistment League, of which one Mrs. J. Sergeant Crime is secretary, is also opposed to universal service. Benedict Arnold or Judas Iscariot would be a better sounding name for an officer of such an organization as the Antienlistment League.

Another Spanish War veteran who writes—Mr. Frank C. Burmeister, of Kalamazoo—says, in part:

We glory in the stand you have taken in this crisis and hope you may always continue to fight for the right, as you have done.

Col. W. H. Thielman, of the Thirty-fourth Michigan, writes, in part:

When I use the word "universal" I mean that all young men should have this training, whether they are physically fit or not. It at least gives them discipline, and in case of war the physically unfit would be in fine shape to fill clerical positions, also positions in the commissary and Quartermaster's departments.

If time would permit, I would like to read you many more letters from men who have seen service. They all saw service either in Cuba or the Philippines or Porto Rico, and they all favor universal training, universal service, and the selective draft. They all know from experience how absolutely fatal it would be for the United States to go into this war with another experiment of the volunteer system.

Some of the opponents of universal service claim that it will make our boys more "bloodthirsty." Playing football, running races, and so forth, does not make a boy bloodthirsty; it makes him more self-reliant and more fitted for the battles of life.

Some of the strongest indorsements I have received have been from ministers of the gospel.

Rev. W. B. Coombe, First Methodist Episcopal Church, Crystal Falls, Mich., writes me:

The State press report that you are in favor of the selective draft. Glad to know it. On the right track, as usual. I have not heard a single person say aught against it. The people seem to think it is the only fair thing and proper way.

The following letter from Rev. Charles J. Johnson, of Marquette, Mich., speaks for itself:

APRIL 2, 1917.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,

Representative in Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inform you that at a patriotic service held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church last Sunday evening, April 1, that the inclosed memorial was signed by the citizens whose names appear thereon (excepting several whose signatures were secured this morning), and it is transmitted to you with the request that the same be presented to the House of Representatives.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES J. JOHNSON.

"We express our conviction that the safety and security of our Republic requires that we definitely recognize the principle that the duty of defending the Nation rests equally upon all citizens capable of service. We would earnestly urge, therefore, that measures be taken for the immediate establishment of a permanent, adequate, and democratic system of national defense based upon universal military, industrial, and scientific service according to the capacity of each citizen."

"We also express our conviction that if the United States of America speaks as a Nation fully prepared for defense it can best serve the cause of international righteousness and universal peace."

Rev. Ernest M. Stires, D. D., St. Thomas's Church, in a sermon on Sunday last, well said:

Let the law take it for granted that all are ready to defend their country, their principles, and humanity. No other method is honest. We must not ask the unselfish to die that the selfish may live and flourish. We must not allow a man to serve on the firing line if some special skill makes him a hundredfold more useful in some other place. Honor may make him enlist, but experts should determine where each may serve best. Universal enlistment is the only fair, honest, economic method. With all my heart I approve the reply a friend of mine made some time ago to a pacifist. He said, "I will gladly join you in praying for peace if you will join me in preparing for war; then, whatever happens, we will be ready."

The beloved Bishop Fallows, one of the best-known Civil War veterans, said recently:

Universal military training will never develop a spirit of militarism in this country. It is a democratic movement and the very antithesis of militarism. I can remember over 50 years ago, when the same cry of militarism was raised after the close of the Civil War. Many well-meaning people said that with 2,000,000 soldiers back of him Gen. Grant would become a military dictator and that democracy in the United States would disappear. But those 2,000,000 soldiers returned to civil life after having saved the Union, and democracy in the United States became more of a living reality than it had been before. Military training has not developed militarism in Switzerland, Australia, or in our own State of Wyoming. I would like to ask the women of our country who oppose military training which they would prefer for their sons, the military camp or the pool room in our large cities?

"War is hell." Of course it is. It always was and always will be. "Bleeding Belgium" knows that "war is hell"; brave France knows that "war is hell."

We may have to decide in the future whether we wish to send a sufficient army to keep the "hell"—the burning of towns, the famine, raping, etc., in Europe or keep our Army here and have another "hell" over here later on. And I am in favor of confining the "hell" to Europe. Some people think we ought not to commence fighting until New York Harbor is attacked; others seem to think we ought to wait until they attack Michigan Avenue, Chicago; others seem to think we ought to wait until Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas are to be attacked.

The time to fight is as soon as we can get ready; the place to fight is where the enemy is now.

If the central powers can not be defeated by the nations now allied against her, they would find "easy picking" fighting us alone.

If we had—as we should have done—adopted a system of universal military training service years ago, we would not now be in the position of going in with other powers to defeat the common enemy. We would have had an efficient fighting force of fifteen to sixteen million men—an Army large enough to command the respect of every nation, central powers and the allied nations alike.

When the allies were going to blockade the Swedish coast some time ago, Sweden wrote one note of protest to the allies, but it was effective. Why? The allies knew that while Sweden only had a population of 6,000,000 it had 1,000,000 men who knew how to shoot, and to shoot straight. They believed that 1,000,000 Swedes could keep 3,000,000 Russians busy, and they changed their plans.

We have been writing notes to everybody for over two years. We have written to France, Spain, Mexico, Great Britain, Ger-

many, and Austria, and have received not a satisfactory reply from any of them. If we had the army of free men fighting for a free Nation that universal military service would have given us, we would have received an immediate satisfactory reply from all of these nations, and we would not now be at war.

I have always claimed that at the outbreak of the war in Europe we should have served notice on every nation—allies and central powers alike—that we expected every right that we had according to international law respected, peacefully we hoped, but that we intended to maintain these rights by force, if necessary; and further, that we should have immediately commenced a system of universal training and service. If we had, I believe that we would have kept out of war. But these things are past and gone; it is "a condition, not a theory" that confronts us now; and it is up to us to do the best thing and the right thing now, not next month or next year.

Practically every man in the twelfth Michigan works in or around mines—copper and iron. There never was any doubt about the patriotism of these men, and if anyone believes that the miners are against universal service, selective draft, or a system so that "each man will do his 'bit,'" whichever you wish to call it, he ought to come up to the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

They had a patriotic meeting at Ishpeming on the 18th, preceded by the largest parade ever held in the city. Among those on the program were gentlemen representing business men, doctors, women, mechanics, bankers, clergy, lawyers, immigrants, clerical forces, and the men working in the mines.

The papers state that the hit of the evening was made by those representing the miners.

Let me read to you part of the speech made by a miner, Mr. William Pryor:

I stand before you to-night to represent the miners, a band of noble and true men, whose hearts are throbbing and pulsating with love and patriotism for their country. Never in the history of our country has she been called to face a problem such as this. For three years we have stood on the banks and watched nation after nation drawn into the whirlpool until now we ourselves are caught in its clutches; and now the question is, Are we prepared to emerge with flying colors and to bring this warfare to a successful issue? The question is raised, Is the miner capable of producing enough mineral so that we can make ammunition enough and guns enough to protect our land? And I can hear the answer rising from a million throats that we are prepared.

All down through the ages the miner has played an important part in the progress of the world. We have stood the test of time; we have been the main spoke in the wheel of industry, and now we are called upon to produce the ore that is necessary for the advancement of our country. We have gone down into the depths and have brought forth the unseen wealth of our country. We have produced the gold and silver for the coins; we have produced iron ore for the building of our ships; we are going to protect this great Nation of ours. We have risen to the surface the coal that is necessary to use to warm our homes; we have gone down into the mines and have raised copper, lead, and zinc, and many other things to make ammunition to defend our country, and I feel sure, I am confident that in this great crisis the miner will rise to the occasion and will again bring forth the necessities, so that we can go forth and carry the flag and win this war successfully.

But, brother miners, that is not all that is required of us. We may be called upon to shoulder the gun and defend our flag, and I am confident that when that call comes the miners of this country will not be weighed in the balance and found wanting. We realize that it is better to serve our Nation for a period of war than to serve a foreign nation for the remainder of our lives. This struggle that we have entered into has not been our seeking. Our President and his Cabinet have done all in their power to evade this great crisis, but now it has come. Uncle Sam has gone in, and we will not let go until this German bully pays the debt he owes us and our flag.

We are Americans true; we will fight just like our fathers did, so for good old America we stand, a band of brothers, each by each and all by all, until she wins a glorious victory over her German foe.

Another miner, Mr. John Gray, said, in part, as follows:

I have been called upon to tell you what the sentiment is among the Cleveland miners in regard to the President's recent appeal. I can tell you that in a very few words: They are all willing to give the best there is in them, and will back the President to the last man. I have been working in and around the mines for more than 35 years and have met, and been intimate with, all the different nationalities of which the mining force is composed, and I find that they are the same to-day as they were 35 years ago—always among the first to answer our country's call, no matter what they are called to do.

Just at present, according to President Wilson's appeal, the iron miners can do more for the Government by staying at home and digging iron ore than we can by entering either the Army or Navy.

This is true, because the iron is necessary to carry on the war, and because of their experience the miners can work to the best advantage where they are now. Let me assure you that the men are ready and willing to dig iron ore; but, on the other hand, if conditions become such that they can render better service by fighting than by digging, they will be just as willing then to shoulder the gun as they are now to shoulder the pick.

Those whom President Wilson wants to enlist just now are the young men, the nonproducers.

I am not opposed to the "volunteer service" bill because I am afraid that my people will object to being conscripted. My people are willing to do their share, whether it is in the mine getting out copper and iron for munitions, whether it is to raise crops for the fighters, or whether it is to do the real fighting. In fact, many of the men who have already enlisted to fight could be of more service in the mines.

I have talked universal training and service for over two years. The people of the twelfth Michigan, while willing to do their share, want to know that the other man is also going to do his share. They know there is only one system by which each man can be made to do his "bit," and that is by the "selective draft."

Every man in my district is either an immigrant or the son of an immigrant, but they all are Americans.

They did not want war and hoped the same as myself, that war would not be forced on us. But we are at war, not on account of our own actions, but because another nation has forced war upon us.

I voted to table the McLemore resolution; I was against any embargo on munitions; I voted to declare that a state of war exists; I voted for the so-called billion-dollar bond bill; and I am going to vote for this bill as recommended by the President and by the General Staff.

There are thousands of former inhabitants of Germany and Austria in my district, but I have yet to receive a single criticism from any of those former Germans and Austrians because I voted to stand by the President instead of by the Kaiser. Gentlemen who believe that it is popular to sympathize with the central powers against this country mistake the good sense and patriotism of their people "back home."

At the time of tabling the McLemore resolution some Members who voted right were afraid they had offended their former German or Austrian constituents.

To show how my people felt, at the same time I received a letter from Mr. J. J. Wershay, of Calumet, Mich., secretary of the Austrian Rod and Gun Club, asking how they could affiliate with the American National Rifle Association. Why? To fight for the central powers? No; to fight as good Americans for this country.

A little later, when some people tried to foment strife among the Croatians, they held a mass meeting and asked the would-be trouble makers to leave the district. A mass meeting of the Croatians of Calumet was held on April 8, and strong resolutions, a copy of which I placed in the Record, were passed, in which they said, in part:

We are in absolute accord and sympathy with the declaration of the President and Congress of the United States, and we tender the President and Congress an enthusiastic and whole-hearted support and assistance in any demand that they may make upon us in this war that is now being waged for freedom of mankind and the triumph of liberty and justice.

Signed by Rev. Joseph Medin, Ph. D., chairman of the meeting.

The different German societies have appointed committees to draw up resolutions of their loyal attitude.

At a meeting held at the Germania Hall some time ago of the Eagles, the chairman of the meeting, Mr. T. J. Otto, was a German, and the principal speaker, Mr. Henry J. Lemcke, was a German. The following letter from Mr. Lemcke explains the attitude of 99 per cent of those of foreign birth and parentage:

SAGINAW, MICH., March 29, 1917.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: Permit me to express myself anent your speech delivered in Hancock, Mich., on the day of the public meeting held under the auspices of Aerie No. 352 of Eagles. Your speech on Americanism appealed to me and made a decided impression on all present, as was evidenced by the hearty and spontaneous applause which greeted your remarks.

As I informed the audience on that occasion, I again reiterate that I am of German parentage, that my dear old father, although a resident of this country nearly 50 years, was so German that he had not acquired the use of our language and spoke very broken English, yet withal he was a patriotic American citizen, believed in these United States against all foreign powers. I am proud of this fact, and also that the son is a firm believer in our institutions, always has been, and always will be.

Although my political affiliations have always been with the Republican Party, I say, and want to be emphatic in this declaration, that Woodrow Wilson is our President. We must stand by him. It is our duty always to uphold the dignity of our flag and our country. In doing these things we are simply carrying out the principles of the greatest patriotic fraternal society in all the world, the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

With personal good wishes to you, I remain,
Very sincerely,

HENRY J. LEMCKE,
Grand Worthy Chaplain, F. O. E.

As I said, I am not opposed to the volunteer service bill because I am afraid that my friends will object to being conscripted. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] stated one reason why he was for "selective draft" was that he did not want his Irish friends to do all the fighting—he wanted to pass part of the glory around.

I doubt whether even the Irish in Boston have as good a record as that of Ironwood, in my district. In 1910 it had a population of about 14,000. About 10 days ago they sent 65 volunteers, according to a letter from one of the business men there. In a telegram from one of its prominent business men, Mr.

William Nancarrow, he informs me that 100 more left last Friday. The balance of the county has sent enough to make it 200. I understand they expect to send 100 more shortly. I know most of these men, and I wish that many of them had kept at work in the mines, as I believe they would have been of more service to their country working in the mines at this time. The remarkable part of this is the fact that there had been no recruiting officer at Ironwood. All of these boys went to the post office and enlisted, and all joined the Regular Army.

The people of Ironwood are for the selective draft, according to all the information that I receive from that county, and want to know that while they are "doing their bit" the rest of the country will also do their "bit."

If there ever was any question as to whether or not the people and their sons, who come here from Europe, would be loyal the names of the first 65 speak for themselves. They include Polish, British, French, Scandinavian, Finnish, Austrian, German, Irish, and Italian.

I give the names as published in the Ironwood Times and the Ironwood News-Record:

William Thompson, John Zvonsowski, Wandy Dudwl, William Leary, Howard Shelly, Andrew J. Sopko, Pito Falsi, Leslie Kacsir, Arvid C. Forsberg, Albert Kruchy, Herbert Smitham, Verne Anderson, Peter Grenfell, Angelo Zanella, John L. Nichols, Ernest J. Thomas, Fred W. Pickard, Jake Yankoski, John Leonard Olson, Benhard Orhn, David Hedlund, John Kinsmanich, Isaac Turner, Henry Hayes, Thomas Nattson, Adam Blazikowski, Lenkey Wick, John P. Shea, Roy Johnson, Frank Ramettu, Fred Kazvinsky, Nick Tregear, E. R. Staples, Isaac Chouinard, Ernest Nicholls, Edwin Carlson, Edward Psutka, Robert Johnson, William Johnson, Russell Mitchell, Clarence Halquist, William Pollari, Harvey Carlson, Edward J. Ossowski, Joseph D. Sobolewski, Harold Erickson, Sam Usitola, Louis Duroy, Joe M. Sniezeck, Eugene A. Halsey, John Guouf, Paul Kolson, John Holeccheck, Leonard Welch, Edward Duffey, John Figull, Charles Bentzen, John Kachanski, Victor Kohkonen, Joseph Calligaro.

Many more enlistments, many the sons of immigrants, also enlisted from Iron Mountain, Iron River, Negaunee, Marquette, Calumet, Hancock, Houghton, and other towns in the twelfth Michigan district, but I have not yet been able to get a complete list.

A patriotic meeting was held at Iron River, Mich., a few days ago, and in resolutions adopted by over 3,000 voters they advocated universal service as the only fair and democratic system for the defense of the country. Similar meetings have been held all over the district, and more have been called. All are for universal service—selective draft.

One of the best arguments in favor of universal military service, conscription or selective draft—whichever you wish to call it; neither name frightens me—was made the other day by President Wilson in a letter to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING]:

The principle of selective draft, in short, has at its heart this idea: That there is a universal obligation to serve and that a public authority should choose those on whom the obligation of military service shall rest, and also in a sense choose those who shall do the rest of the Nation's work.

The bill if adopted will do more, I believe, than any other single instrumentality to create the impression of universal service in the Army and out of it, and if properly administered will be a great source of stimulation.

I took occasion the other day in an address to the people of the country to point out the many forms of patriotic service that were open to them, and to emphasize the fact that the military part of the war was by no means the only part and, perhaps, all things considered, not the most vital part.

Our object is a mobilization of all productive and active forces of the Nation and their development to the point of cooperation and efficiency.

The idea of the selective draft is that those should be chosen for service in the Army who can be most readily spared from the prosecution of the other activities which the country must engage in, and to which it must devote a great deal of its best energy and capacity.

The volunteer system does not do this.

When men choose themselves they sometimes choose without due regard to their other responsibilities.

Men may come from the farms or from the mines or from the factories or centers of business, who ought not to come, but ought to stand back of the armies in the field and see that they get everything that they need and that the people of the country are sustained in the meantime.

Those who feel that we are turning away altogether from the volunteer principle seem to forget that some 600,000 men will be needed to fill the ranks of the Regular Army and the National Guard and that a very great field of individual enthusiasm lies there, wide open, for all who wish to volunteer.

Another thing that we ought to do before we go home, if the law is not already strong enough, is to provide for death to every man who cheats this country by delivering inferior goods of any kind in either Army contracts or Navy contracts. [Applause.]

There are many people living to-day who are suffering from the "embalmed-beef" outrages of 1898. As has been well said, "the embalmed-beef outrages of the Spanish-American War were so unspeakably vile that the mere mention of them to-day nearly 20 years later, brings the blush of shame to every honest man. Shoddy uniforms, paper shoes, inferior powder, and

rotten food have been our invariable experience in time of war." The "embalmed beef" was bad enough, but when you were fed on so-called "fresh beef" which you had to scrape the "gangrene" off of before you tried to cook it was worse. A man who will do things of this kind is a traitor to his country, and ought to meet the fate of a traitor. [Applause.]

I would not ask anyone to do what I have not done and would not do, and what I am not willing to have my own sons do. I have two sons that are as dear to me as any sons are to their father. I know that in case of war, they are going to enlist. I want them to have a chance for their lives. The ones who enlisted in 1861 and 1898 did not have that chance, and if you pass the Dent bill, there are thousands of boys that will not have a chance for their lives to-day. I want to see a good system of universal training, universal service, and selective draft, so that every man will have to do his share, and every man who goes to fight will know what to do and have officers who know how to take care of him. I don't want my sons to have to do any fighting for the sons of men who are too "yellow" to enlist themselves, and whose sons are too "yellow" to enlist.

Every man should teach his son that it is not only his privilege but it is his duty to serve his country in any capacity that his country can best use him in time of war.

Let no one tell you as you grow
That nothing to the flag you owe;
Let no one whisper that it means
But pleasant days and peaceful scenes,
And merely calls to mind a land
Where wealth abounds on every hand,
Because no more that flag will fly
When men for it refuse to die.

And it may be, said I, "That you
Must some day serve that banner, too,
And then if such a day should come
That sounds again the stirring drum,
And blows once more the martial life,
Be not a slave to peaceful life.
As they were men, be you a man,
And give that flag the best you can."

—Eddie Guest.

My district is strongly Republican, but some of the strongest letters that I have received to stand by the administration in this crisis are from rock-ribbed Republicans who voted the straight Republican ticket last fall. They realize that this is no time to talk partisan politics.

We are now a participant in the most bloody of all wars; our very existence as a Nation depends upon the outcome of the war. There is only one Nation that is financially able to pay an indemnity in case of defeat—we represent that Nation. This war can not be won by talk—it can only be won by the best army that can be raised. This is no time to try another experiment with a system that has always failed us.

We need men to mine the ore; we need men to raise the crops; we need men to make the munitions; we need men to do the fighting—the selective draft places each man where he can be of the most service to his country—it makes each man do his "bit."

The question of What is "good politics"? is not the question. Suppose our efforts should be temporarily misconstrued; it is more important to this country that this war shall be won quickly with the least number of men dying from disease and wounds than it is that we shall be returned to Congress. The selective draft is the only fair and equitable way—let us pass it unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3545 and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. CANNON was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Michael Rappel, H. R. 14921, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and that general debate shall be continued on the bill H. R. 3545 under the same agreement heretofore obtaining, to run not later than 10 o'clock to-morrow night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, and that general debate

shall be continued under the previous agreement to a time not later than 10 o'clock to-morrow night. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suppose that means that the House will remain in continuous session?

Mr. DENT. That is the idea.

Mr. MANN. And that the bill will not be read for amendment to-morrow in any case?

Mr. DENT. The bill will not be read for amendment to-morrow.

Mr. MAPES. And that means that general debate shall close to-morrow night?

Mr. DENT. That means that if we should conclude general debate prior to 10 o'clock to-morrow night, I shall move to rise and then move to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein a memorial signed by all of the teachers of economic and political science in Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, relating to raising war finances by taxation.

Mr. MANN. Does this have the approval of the gentleman's colleague?

Mr. RAMSEYER. It has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 71.

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House be granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

VOTE ON THE BOND BILL.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of April, when the bond-issue question was up, and at the close of the general debate, I understood that there would be no roll call the next day, and I responded to a request to make an address at Springfield, Ohio, on the following evening, and therefore I am recorded as absent, as I was. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the address I delivered on the war in Springfield, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech he made in Springfield, Ohio. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1917.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Commerce submitting estimates of appropriations required by the Department of Commerce for the fiscal years 1917 and 1918 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$22,000, required by the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3650) to amend the act to regulate commerce, as amended, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 20), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1006) authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 21), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1679) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 22), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1845) to authorize Peter Goellet Gerry to enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the United States, for use of the steam yacht *Oicera*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 19), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 3772) prohibiting the use of false weights and measures and prescribing penalties therefor; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Flandreau Band of Santee Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3774) fixing the rate of postage on letters and mail matter sent to the soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3775) for the abolishment of the Office of Indian Affairs, the closing out of Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) for the abolishment of the Board of Indian Commissioners; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 3777) to change the name of oleomargarine to butterine, and to change the rate of tax on butterine; to protect the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers of all kinds of butterine against fraud; and to afford the Bureau of Internal Revenue more efficient means for the detection of fraud and the collection of the revenue; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 3778) authorizing a preliminary examination of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 3779) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Norwalk, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 3780) to permit the manufacture of denatured alcohol by mixing domestic and wood alcohol while in process of distillation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 3781) to provide for the selection and acquisition of a suitable site on the Houston ship channel, in the State of Texas, at some point between Morgans Point and the Turning Basin near the city of Houston, and to erect thereon a navy yard, dry dock, a naval training station, an arsenal, and an ordnance factory; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 3782) to provide a preliminary survey of the Savannah River, at Augusta, Ga., with the view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 3783) to permit the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to enter into certain contracts without complying with the provisions of section 3709,

Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 3784) to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3785) to establish a branch Federal land bank in west Texas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) authorizing the transfer of the building recently erected for the Interior Department on square No. 143, in the city of Washington, to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution (H. Res. 70) authorizing the printing of 4,500 copies of the Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on their investigation of the financial history and operation of the Pere Marquette Railroad Co. and the Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 3786) for the relief of C. R. Shaw, Allen Shaw, and Robert Shaw; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) granting an increase of pension to William A. Chappelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 3790) granting a pension to I. C. Livingston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: (H. R. 3791) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 3792) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) granting a pension to Fred Silvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3794) granting a pension to Bethel J. Goff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 3795) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jubal Grant and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 3796) granting a pension to Martha A. Cary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bradish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Rickart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Amanda Ball Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3800) for the relief of the heirs of Felix Scott Chambers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting a pension to George S. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 3802) granting a pension to Victor A. Patterson, alias Victor Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 3803) for the relief of Mrs. Charles Petzel, widow of Charles Petzel, formerly a letter carrier in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Pinksohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Federation of Citizens' Associations, of Washington, D. C., favoring fixing prices by the Government on all foodstuffs, etc., during the war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petitions of sundry economists and political scientists, relative to taxation for financing the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted at a patriotic mass meeting of citizens at Coshocton, Ohio, indorsing the

declaration of war and pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Engineers' Club of Trenton, N. J., favoring selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, for Federal control of military forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, in re general military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Telegram from E. G. Rauber, secretary Wisconsin Pharmaceutical Association, representing 1,015 druggists of Wisconsin and members of the association, protesting against the imposition of a stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of Lawyers' Club of Washington, D. C., favoring compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Association of Collegiate Alumnae, favoring suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of Tavern Club of Boston, upholding the President and favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, in re war-revenue legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn and Queens, N. Y., providing different legislation relative to revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Alaska Legislature in connection with the consideration of House bill 20783; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Automobile Club of America, favoring compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lawyers' Club of Washington, D. C., favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, pledging loyalty and support to the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, protesting against the reimposition of Schedule B of the emergency war-revenue act, which places a stamp tax upon the products of this industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the American Society of Civil Engineers, of New York City, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Illinois Society, Sons of the Revolution, Chicago, Ill., favoring the raising of an army by conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Merchants' Association of New York City, N. Y., favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the University Club, of Rockford, Ill., favoring universal compulsory military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, pledging loyalty and support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of F. A. Moore and others, of Cobalt, Conn., favoring conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Piedmont, Mo., favoring prohibition as a war emergency measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Messrs. Jessup, Harris & Dunn, of Stamford, Conn., in favor of universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Ruling Elders' Association of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, N. J., relative to prohibiting the use of grain for malt or spirituous liquors during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Essex Trade Council, Newark, N. J., favoring Government control of food supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 72 citizens of Trenton, N. J., favoring selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Engineers' Club of Trenton, N. J., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Protest of Bucilla Crochet Club, of Little Rock, Ark., against slaughter of veal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: Memorial of Presbytery of Cincinnati Presbyterian Church in the United States, for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Rev. T. Johnson Bolger, C. N. Ellis, John S. Logan, and 245 other citizens of Elmira, N. Y., and vicinity, urging a nation unhindered by the liquor traffic, with all its miserable wake of wasted money and manhood, during the time of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Presbytery of Binghamton, N. Y., by George J. Michelbach, chairman, urging the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Indorsement of John D. Hay, of San Francisco, Cal., of selective-draft bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegrams of C. Osgood Hooker, Burlingame; Lloyd P. LaRue, Grass Valley; Thomas A. Davies, grand recorder, Knights Templars, Sacramento; George W. Metvalfem, Kennett; Judge Francis Carr, Redding; A. D. Foote, C. E. Clinch, George W. Starr, and C. R. Clinch, Grass Valley, all in the State of California; and National Committee of Patriotic and Defense Societies, Military Training Camps Association of the United States, American Rights League, Aero Club of America, Naval Training Association of the United States, National Security League, American Defense Society, Business Men's National Service League, Mayor's Committee on National Defense, and Conference Committee on National Preparedness, Washington, D. C., indorsing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the lumber trade of the metropolitan district, for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Brooklyn Engineers' Club, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Memorial of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philipsburg, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bellefonte, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution of citizens of Franklin County, N. Y., that the President and Congress of the United States be requested to use all the power at their command to conserve the food supply of the country by closing breweries and distilleries during the continuation of the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of 1,200 citizens of Saranac Lake, N. Y., pledging their support on the administration Army bill providing for selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of citizens of Middleville, N. Y., favoring prohibition of manufacture of alcoholic beverages during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of citizens of Little Falls and Clinton, N. Y., favoring amendment abolishing polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Rhode Island Dental Society, to place dental surgeons of the Army on an equal basis with the Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the Republican Club of New York, indorsing the Chamberlain bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Memorial of the Maryland Society of the Sons of American Revolution, urging compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Rockville Christian Church, urging the passage of the national prohibition law, at least for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.